

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVIII. No. 23 }
WHOLE No. 465 }

MARCH 16, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR }

Chronicle

The War.—During the week the momentum of battle increased along the western front. In the Toul sector occupied by the American troops, where they hold about eight miles, the enemy raids were frequent and severe. In every case

Bulletin, Mar. 4, p.m.
Mar. 11, a.m.

our troops behaved with a cool bravery which won the highest praise from the French officers and in several instances won for officers and men official rewards. Americans are also holding positions on the Lorraine and Alsace fronts, in Champagne, and on the Chemin des Dames. With men, material, and supplies moving forward to General Pershing in accordance with the prearranged schedule, the War Department has taken up the organization of our first field army. Until General Pershing has under command a complete field army, no further organization will be started. When completely organized this first American field army may be able to take over 100 miles of the French line. Censorship regulations prohibit the publication of the approximate date on which this event will occur. It is not probable that it will take place much before the end of the present year. Mr. Baker, Secretary of War, is on the American front on a tour of inspection.

The French and the British registered striking local successes against the enemy. The former made a heavy raid on the German trenches at Calonne east of the Meuse. In a surprise assault they drove into the enemy's line there to the depth of a third of a mile on a front of two-thirds of a mile and reached the German fourth line. They brought back 150 prisoners. British troops penetrated the German trenches north of Passchendaele, south of Hollebeke, east of Messines and near Warneton. What was probably one of the most stubborn fights of the week took place on the Ypres-Dixmude sector of the British front. A German attack on a front of over a mile compelled some of the British outposts to fall back on a front of about 500 yards. Marshal Haig reports, however, that the British regained the lost ground and pushed beyond the enemy's former positions. He reports also that at the same time the enemy's artillery showed considerable activity in the neighborhood of Flesquières, in the Givenchy, Neuve Chapelle and Armentières sections and east of Ypres. Bulletins from the Berlin War Office,

from the front of Crown Prince Rupprecht announced the capture of some English and Belgian prisoners north-east of Festubert. According to General Allenby's dispatch British troops astride the Jerusalem-Nablus road in Palestine are making steady progress. Little opposition is encountered. On one day alone, March 7, the English advance was to a maximum depth of three miles on a frontage of eighteen miles. In Mesopotamia the British have occupied Hit, eighty miles west of Bagdad on the right bank of the Euphrates.

The question of the interference of Japan in Siberia has developed considerable differences of opinion between the United States and the various members of the

Entente. The issue discloses a diver-

Siberia and Japan gence of opinion between Mr. Wilson on the one hand, and Mr. Lloyd

George and Mr. Clemenceau on the other. Military considerations urge the Allies to support the plan to defend Siberia and the supplies at Vladivostok and along the Trans-Siberian Railway against Germany. Political considerations impel Mr. Wilson to disapprove it. The Government of the United States is aware that intervention by any Power in Siberia would be looked upon by the Russian people as an infringement on their national integrity and liberties, and for that reason would be inadvisable. The Government has not formally assented to Japan's plan. Neither on the other hand has it formally dissented or protested. On the whole the Government is inclined to question the political wisdom and the military necessity of Japan entering Siberia without being invited by the Russians themselves. In government circles no open distrust of Japan has been officially manifested. It is rather the interests of Russia about which our officials are most concerned.

In general, the opinion in the United States appears opposed to President Wilson's attitude which at present at least would leave Japan liberty of intervention, though the President would neither formally assent or dissent to the action. Among the papers which take this view are the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, the *Boston Transcript*, the *Baltimore American*, the *Indianapolis News*, the *New York Globe*, the *New York Times*, the *New York Tribune*, the *New York Herald*, the *Chicago Herald*,

the *Chicago News*, the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Portland Oregonian*, the *Providence Journal* and the *Atlanta Constitution*. Arrayed against these are those papers which point to the "yellow peril" such as the *New York American*, the *New York Journal*; also the *New York World*, the *Springfield Republican*, and the *New York Evening Post*. The English press is divided on the advisability of Japanese action, the influential *Manchester Guardian* leading the opposition to the measure. In Paris the *Petit Journal*, the organ of the Foreign Minister, Mr. Pichon, is on the other hand one of the foremost advocates of Japanese intervention. The advocates of immediate intervention by Japan propound reasons of an almost purely military character. Aside from the matter of food stores and the safety of the Trans-Siberian Railway, Allied interests in general are said to need protection. French interests in China and British concern both over India and China are put forth as a pretext, together with Japan's own peculiar interests recently recognized by the United States in the Ishii treaty. Danger of German penetration in the East is another reason given. With regard to the latter danger, Lord Robert Cecil has made the following statement to the Associated Press:

Look at what Germany has already done toward a scheme of world conquest! On the north she has taken rich Baltic provinces, over which she purposes to install a German prince. She has sent troops to Finland, and concluded an agreement which puts the whole foreign policy of Finland at her disposal. These steps in the north have practically cut off Russia from access to the sea.

Looking further south we find that Germany is in the course of occupying Odessa, the greatest Black Sea port, and that she has insisted that Russia cede to Turkey all ports at the east end of the Black Sea. Her evident design is to substitute for the Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad a new avenue to the East by Transcaucasia and Northern Persia. In the execution of this design Germany, moreover, has had, consciously or unconsciously, the assistance and cooperation of the Bolsheviks.

Look at the plight of Armenia! Both Great Britain and America have always taken a deep interest and sympathy in this unhappy people. Armenian refugees who fled into Transcaucasia are now, under the Russo-German treaty, to be handed back to the Turks.

You have only to look at the map to see what a tremendous scheme of conquest Germany has undertaken. Having been thwarted in her plan to conquer France, this is the second string to her bow, and for the moment the whole German people seems to be backing the new imperialistic scheme.

The military control of Germany is paramount and unshaken. German democracy is docile and servile. The Allies must adopt every means in their power to frustrate Germany's designs in the East.

It is also urged that a Japanese army in Siberia would compel Germany to maintain strong forces on the Eastern front, while Russia is now so far gone that Allied troops in her territories would help towards her reintegration after the war.

Those who approve President's Wilson's policy of "aloofness" base their reasons on Russia. They maintain that it is not the fate of the stores at Vladivostok

or the grain of Siberia which is at issue but the credit of the cause and the whole moral position of the Allies. They ask their opponents with what consistency the Allies can lend themselves to an assault on one part of the Russian Empire at the time when the Germans are engaged in a similar assault on another part? A new international question has evidently developed from the Russo-Japanese situation. Many serious-minded statesmen both in the United States and abroad believe that if once Japan gets into Siberia, she will stay there and that her advance is likely to be another example "of the annexationist imperialism which many democrats hoped would be discouraged by the political results of the war."

The Russian debacle expands the German dreams of conquest in the East beyond Germany's most sanguine hopes. With the advance of the German armies peace,

The Russian Debacle

food and unlimited supplies are brought within the grasp of the German people. Petrograd is cut off, German troops advance to Jamburg, to within sixty miles of the capital, Kiev falls, and the seat of government is moved to Moscow. In addition to the humiliating terms thrust upon the Bolshevik Government in accordance with which, besides the territories ceded to Germany, Turkey gets the region of Karabad, Kars and Batoum, bordering on Persia and the Black Sea, Germany on March 4 signed a treaty with Finland. By this treaty, Finland is placed under the material, political, and moral tutelage of Germany. The German policy is not of a nature to calm Sweden's uneasiness, especially in the face of a rumor that one of the Kaiser's sons was to be placed upon the throne of Finland, a rumor so far unconfirmed. The intervention in Finland, the occupation by German troops of the Aland Islands, the attitude taken towards Norway and Denmark, all seem to belong to a plan carefully worked out, to make the Baltic a German lake and to establish German domination over Scandinavia.

The humiliating collapse of Russia before the German arms and the German diplomacy led to what seems to portend grave events. By March 9 a serious movement to overthrow the Bolshevik Government and presumably to repudiate the peace agreement with the Central Powers, was reported in several dispatches reaching London. Almost simultaneously came the confirmation of an earlier rumor that Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik Commissioner of Foreign Affairs, had resigned his post. According to dispatches from Irkutsk, in Siberia, printed in the *Petrograd Pravda*, organ of the Bolsheviks, Prince Lvoff, the ex-President of the Council of Ministers of Russia, had constituted in the Far East a new Russian Government with its temporary seat at Peking and was awaiting the landing of Japanese troops at Vladivostok to enter Siberian territory with them. Other dispatches suggest the recrudescence of the original idea of starting a counter-revolution in Southern Russia with the Don Cossacks as the basis of a great army. Rumania was forced to sign what she considers

a disastrous and dishonorably inflicted peace. By it she loses her seacoast and the Dobrudja as far as the Danube. She is also forced to permit the passage of German troops through her territory to Odessa.

Under date of March 9, the New York *Evening Post* published six secret diplomatic documents from the files of the Russian Foreign Office, revealed by the Bolshe-

**More Secret
Treaties**

vist Government. The first three, the *Post* says in its foreword to the text of the documents, are dispatches from the Russian Ambassador at Tokio, Japan, October 16 and 22, and November 1, 1917, and are of especial interest to the United States. The first deals with the question of the sale of Japanese arms to China. The next two, according to the summary of the New York paper, gives the Ambassador's understanding of the Japanese attitude towards the Lansing-Ishii agreement and relates a conversation with Viscount Motono, Minister of Foreign Affairs, explaining the Viscount's views as to the likelihood of any misunderstanding arising because of different interpretation by Japan and the United States of the meaning of the terms "special position" and "special interests" of Japan and China.

The fourth document is a secret telegram from Terestchenko, Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Ambassadors in Paris, Washington, London, Tokio, and Stockholm, concerning the internal situation of Russia after the loss of Riga. It is important, adds the *Post*, because it emphasizes the intention of the Kerensky Government to continue the war at any cost and with every means available. The fifth document is a secret telegram to the Russian Ambassadors in European capitals, instructing them to refuse to deliver messages from the members of the Soldiers' and Workers' Soviet sent to Petrograd. In the last document, the Russian Government instructs the Ambassador at Madrid, in the event that the King of Spain offered intervention in the war, to decline the offer.

Belgium.—The efforts of General von Falkenhausen to separate Flanders from the rest of Belgium are meeting with strong opposition from the Belgian people. The

**Belgians Resist Ger-
man Intrigue**

arrest and deportation of the judges of the Court of Appeals, with the exception of Judge Jamar, who was arrested but released on account of illness, are officially announced in a dispatch to the Belgian legation. The Court of Appeals incurred the displeasure of the German authorities by instituting proceedings against the few Belgian activists who were working with the German Government for the separation of the Flemish and Walloon portions of Belgium. The Court of Cassation, which suspended its sittings as a protest against the arrest and deportation, has been warned by the German Military Governor that its action is regarded as hostile to the German Government. All judiciary activity has been voluntarily suspended. Protests are being sent

to Havre by communal councils and influential citizens, but Germany is still acting with a strong hand. The Bishops have been prevented from meeting to discuss the situation but have protested individually. The Free University of Brussels, in a protest signed by all the members of the faculty, characterizes the situation as follows:

The German authorities, overwhelmed by the patriotic outburst, have officially forbidden all deliberation or discussion in regard to questions of general policies such as the autonomy of Flanders, and have also forbidden discussion in regard to petitions of protest to the German authorities. Every one who disregards this new German order is menaced with severe punishment in accordance with martial law.

Cardinal Mercier, in a pastoral letter read in all the churches of his diocese, states that "the hearts of the Flemings beat in unison with his own in their desire to maintain Belgium as forever one and indivisible." and he begs his people "to put their trust in their Cardinal and Bishops until such time as they can meet to consider the best interests of the Flemish people, the mother country and the Church." All the Bishops have denounced the immoral action of the tools of Germany who are striving to divide the kingdom.

According to press dispatches, a meeting of the representatives of 110,000 Belgian workmen, members of the Free Christian Labor Union of Belgium, was held at

**Resolutions of Bel-
gian Workmen**

Havre recently, during which expression was given to the workingmen's views, a thing impossible in Belgium.

Resolutions were adopted pronouncing the present war a war of nations rather than a war of classes and protesting against the assumption of diplomatic roles by Socialist groups and against any step or resolution calculated to trouble the minds of the Belgian workmen, and also reproving any idea of contact with labor organizations in enemy countries. The resolutions further declare that mediation by a neutral power, when the occasion arises, would be preferable to any initiative taken by unqualified persons. They suggest that when the proper time does come recourse to the mediation of the Holy See would be indicated as the best course.

The last suggestion has an added significance from the fact that H. Heyman of France, E. Van Queele of Holland, and J. Roscan of England, respectively President, Vice-President and Secretary of the International Christian Union, also participated in the meeting.

Ireland.—On Wednesday, March 6, Mr. John E. Redmond, leader of the Irish Nationalists in the House of Commons, died in London, of heart failure, following a recent operation for intestinal trouble.

**Death of Mr.
Redmond**

Born in 1851 in Ballytrent, Ireland, he was educated at Clongowes Wood and Trinity and was admitted as barrister at Gray's Inn in 1886, later, in 1887, becoming an Irish barrister. He was elected to Parliament to represent New Ross in 1881; from 1885 to 1891 he represented North Wexford; in the last-named year he was elected from Waterford. In 1891 he became the leader of the Parnellites and nine years

later he brought about the union of the two leading Nationalist parties. Mr. Redmond visited the United States twice, once ten years ago and again two years later. His death called forth tributes from many prominent people, even from his bitterest political foes. Lloyd George declared that the House was profoundly shocked by the unexpected news of the death of one of the oldest, most respected and eminent members. Mr. Redmond, the Premier said, had been a member of the House for thirty-seven years and during that period, had grown in the esteem, admiration and affection of the members of all parties. Continuing Lloyd George declared:

That is a great thing to say of any member, but it is the greatest thing to say of a man who was engaged in one of the fiercest controversies of our time. There may be a difference of opinion as to the policy for which he stood and fought, but there is absolutely no difference of opinion as to the ability, judgment, dignity and honor which he devoted to that policy.

To this Mr. Asquith added:

We in this House, even those who differed most acutely and deeply from him, agree without reserve or qualification that he was a great parliamentarian and a true patriot. The House of Commons, Ireland, Great Britain, the whole Empire, is impoverished by his death.

Sir Edward Carson spoke as follows:

I have known Mr. Redmond for thirty-five years and I can say with absolute sincerity that during the whole of that time I cannot recollect that one bitter or personal word ever passed between John Redmond and myself. During the conferences on the Irish question at Buckingham Palace just before the outbreak of the war Mr. Redmond said to me: "For the sake of the old days on the Leinster circuit let's have a good handshake."

After the rebellion of 1916 I had several conversations with John Redmond. Indeed, we were not very far apart in our attempts at a settlement of the Irish question. I remember him saying to me: "Unless we can settle this interminable business you and I will be dead before anything is done to pacify Ireland." He was a great Irishman and an honorable opponent, and as such I mourn his loss.

Lt.-Colonel Sir James Craig, Carson's chief supporter in and out of Parliament, paid this tribute:

With profound sorrow I have learned of the death of Mr. Redmond. Throughout my parliamentary career he has been the leader of the Nationalists, and consequently I have always differed with him politically. But on rare occasions, when brought into closer touch with him, I was captivated by his charm of manner. I never shall forget the generous tributes he paid to the gallantry of the Ulster division or the cordial letter of sympathy he wrote me when my brother was wounded and taken prisoner.

He lived a strenuous life, always for Ireland, and what he believed to be her welfare. He probably had the most difficult task of any party leader in the House of Commons, especially during the last seven or eight years.

His death undoubtedly was hastened by the state of affairs in Ireland, and all we, his colleagues, can say is that a great Irishman has passed away. God rest his soul.

On hearing of Mr. Redmond's death the Convention adjourned for two hours and later passed this resolution:

Throughout the proceedings of the Convention, his wise counsel was an invaluable aid for our guidance. He regarded the

work of the Convention and its outcome as fraught with the most vital interests of the Irish people and the whole Empire.

The London papers also were sympathetic in their remarks. The *Westminster Gazette* remarked:

There is peculiar irony in the stroke of fate which so often removes a political leader just when his life work is on the eve of accomplishment. He bears the burden and heat of the day, and others reap the reward. So we feel of Mr. John Redmond.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* regards the death of Mr. Redmond as a loss to the Empire and adds:

It should bring an admonition to all Irishmen of the part which rests upon themselves to play in shaping their country's welfare. Mr. Redmond brought the fulfilment of all its legitimate ambitions so near that only grave lack of responsible qualities of true democracy can betray the promise of success.

In their Lenten pastoral letters the Irish Bishops protest against the misrepresentations of the Pope, so common during these troublous days; they also object very strongly to the infamous clause XV

The Bishops and the Pope

in the secret treaty, by which his Holiness was to be excluded from all peace movements. Cardinal Logue points out that "the secret pact into which the Allied statesmen entered 'at the suggestion of wretched Italian politicians' was followed by retribution inasmuch as their own proposals for peace ran on the lines of the Pope's suggestions." The Rt. Rev. Dr. McKenna, Bishop of Clogher, writes:

The champions of justice and liberty had . . . bound themselves by secret treaty to support Italy in opposing any and every diplomatic step on the part of the representatives of the Holy See for the conclusion of peace, or in regard to questions arising out of the present war.

Then the Pope's aim and motives were misrepresented, his impartiality was impugned, and worst of all, one of the signatories to the secret compact treated him with insult not so unlike that with which Our Divine Lord, whose Vicar on earth he is, was treated at the court of Herod. The English Government, with a profession of respect and friendship on its lips, was guilty of the outrage of mocking him by sending an ambassador to his Court, while all the time they were bound by secret treaty not to listen to his voice nor allow it to be heard in the counsels of Europe. Whatever flickering confidence in the sincerity of the lofty and altruistic professions of the Allies still lingered on in a not too credulous world, was suddenly extinguished by the revelation of this astounding duplicity.

Fortunately for the world Papal power and influence are not dependent on the goodwill of England or her Allies, and so notwithstanding secret compacts, misrepresentation and insult, the Holy Father's appeal for peace was listened to with profound reverence and respect in every land, and his faithful children everywhere are ready to work and pray for him for the realization of his nobler ideal, to bring back among men the power of the charity of Christ. It is the great need of the world today.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. McHugh, Bishop of Derry, reminds bitter assailants of his Holiness that attacks on him produce a feeling of disgust in the breasts of millions, while Bishop Browne of Cloyne declares that though the hope of saving the world is in God, yet the Pope's efforts to bring about peace have been received with scant courtesy by some of the most important of the warring nations.

The President and the Constitution

ARTHUR J. DE LORIMIER

THE expression, "the Constitution of the United States has become a scrap of paper," is somewhat common. The words are usually uttered, not in resentment, nor as a criticism, but rather as the statement of a sad fact. The underlying sentiment is that our Constitution, having proved itself inadequate under stress of extraordinary events, had to be, for the time being, pigeon-holed.

But is it true that the Constitution has become a "scrap of paper"? There is no doubt that the balance of power has shifted, so that the President has acquired a tremendous, though indefinite, increase of power over what he possessed in peace times, and that Congress is, in practice, little better than an advisory assembly.

For a considerable period after the United States declared war against Germany, most Americans failed to realize that we were no longer living under the free, "easy-going," representative democracy that we had been used to in more happy days. Our failure to realize this fundamental change immediately, is probably attributable to the fact that there was an apparent, intervening period of transition, although in strict reality, the change was automatic and instantaneous.

On April 6, 1917, the existence of a state of war with Germany was declared. The consequent intense excitement kept us from appreciating that the initiative of the President was daily gaining momentum. Internal war measures became frequent, and these war measures always emanated, mediately or immediately, from the White House. Congress, in the abstract, began to resemble a well-oiled machine, controlled directly by levers, situated in the presidential mansion. In a short time, the participation of the United States in the war became an accepted reality in our lives, and we endeavored to settle down into the old grooves. Then came the feeling that things were changed. We who were so little used to coming in contact with the machinery of government, felt and saw the strong arm of the State daily reaching out further in every direction. It was ever the arm of the President. We began to realize that the powers of government formerly so nicely balanced, had shifted, so that the President loomed up with, seemingly, all power, and Congress was reduced to something akin to an advisory body.

Was the spirit of freedom and democracy violently dethroned in our own land at the very instant when we loudly extolled its merits? Was not the Constitution, the embodiment of this generous spirit of freedom and democracy, violated both in letter and spirit?

These questions, formulated in jealous fear and fore-

boding, forced the conclusion, in a calmer mood, that since the paramount consideration was the successful prosecution of the war, and since this depended in great part on unity and celerity of thought and action, great power must be centralized in the President, the Constitution to the contrary notwithstanding. Thus many jumped to the conclusion that the centralization of so much power in the President was inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and that therefore the Constitution had proved itself inadequate.

This conclusion is drawn from a misconception of the constitutional powers of the President. Article II, section 2 of the Constitution reads: "The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States, when called into actual service of the United States." Here we find that, by the words of the Constitution, the moment Congress has declared that a state of war exists between the United States and another nation, the President is invested with an immense increment of power. But is not the President commander-in-chief of the army and navy in peace as well as in war? Yes; but in peace times this power is in abeyance. It is simply a potential power which can become actual, only when the United States has declared that a state of war exists between herself and another country. Moreover, this potential power is checked by the fact that the President, of his own initiative, cannot transform it into actual power. That is only saying that the President has not the power to declare war. This power rests with Congress. Nor can the President take it upon himself to enter into disputes with other nations, and by this means lead the country to a point where Congress must, perforce, declare war. Neither can he decide whether or not a certain act of a foreign power is a *casus belli*, for this is a power vested in Congress. Therefore, in strict reality, the powers of commander-in-chief of the army and navy become actual powers the moment war is declared, and not before. Now if to the powers already inherent in the President as chief executive, the further powers of commander-in-chief of the army and navy be added, it is clear that a real, yet constitutional change, has taken place. The Constitution does not enumerate the powers of the commander-in-chief of the army and navy; but it is a fact, borne out by the testimony of history, that these are so extensive that it is practically impossible to say where the power of the executive begins and where it ends.

It is true that Congress still sits, and that Congress still goes through the form of initiating laws. But it is ap-

parent that Congress, in all matters that pertain, even remotely, to the prosecution of the war, follows the dictation or direction of the President. It may be urged that this does not denote an increase of power in the President, but simply evidences a desire on the part of Congress to work in harmony with the chief executive. This may sometimes be the case, but I think it more rightly denotes acceptance and confirmation by Congress, of the proposition that the President, in all questions relating to the conduct of the war, is paramount. This will be clear, if we suppose that Congress should decline to pass the war measures which the President proposes, and attempt to legislate against his wishes. The President could, of course, use his veto power in the first instance, and if Congress persisted in an endeavor to legislate over his head, he could under the Constitution, refuse to execute the demands of Congress on the ground that its action, since it infringed on his prerogative as commander-in-chief, was null and void. Congress may clothe its ideas in the garb of law, but the President alone has the power to execute the laws, and make them more than empty words. Of course, there is a restriction on him, but we may say, in general terms, that the Constitution, in making him responsible for the conduct of the war, gives him the means and power to initiate and execute any measures, that may reasonably be said to have a direct tendency to promote the successful conclusion of the war.

We may be sure that the statesmen who created our Constitution foresaw the necessary result of thus creating the chief executive, commander-in-chief of the army and navy. We may be sure they realized that this action

would result in the shifting and centralization of power, and that they knew what benefits would be derived from this change, as well as the dangers which might follow. Living in an age of searching inquiry into the science of government, an age, also, of great internal and international discord and strife, they had studied deeply the various forms of government. They knew that the strongest form of government, in face of danger from without, was an autocracy; but they realized too that its inevitable tendencies were despotic and tyrannical. They knew that the form of government, weakest in the face of outside perils, was a pure democracy, by reason of its lack of unity. But they held that a pure democracy was the safest custodian of the liberty and happiness of the people.

The result of their deliberations was not exactly a Constitution constructed upon a compromise theory, but rather a Constitution comprising within itself two forms of government, unblended and distinct. It is just this peculiar combination in our great Constitution that is its glory. To this is due its strength to survive in this time of upheaval as proudly as in the days of international peace and tranquility. In times of peace, the Constitution prescribes a liberal representative form of government, with the powers distributed, nicely balanced and checked, thus insuring a maximum of internal, personal liberty and happiness. But in the hour of turmoil and national jeopardy, it daringly shifts these powers, and instantly transforms a representative democracy into a strong, temporary autocracy, with practically all power vested in the President.

The Mission of the Celt in America

EDWIN RYAN, D.D.

A SHORT time since the people of Limerick were celebrating the feast of St. Ita, with a special Mass and Office granted to the diocese by Pope Pius IX. It would be well if we of Irish blood in America could keep the day, too. Her life would be a valuable lesson to us, for even among Irish saints she is conspicuous as an expression of what we may call that seer-like quality in the national temperament, a trait which is one of the most striking and most valuable characteristics of the Irish soul. A born contemplative and mystic, she exhibits that facility of apprehension in respect to spiritual things which led the Irish not merely to absorb Christianity but to absorb it so thoroughly as to turn nearly the whole island into a monastery. Sad would it be were her American cousins to forfeit this, as the price of worldly prosperity. We are hearing much at the present time about the rights

of small nations; let us not forget the duties of small nations. And if we were to ask the lovely Patroness of Limerick what is the duty of that particular small nation to which she and we belong, I feel she would tell us that in a materialistic age and country we are set up by God to be above others witnesses to the unseen.

For, whatever the "purely scientific" historian may think about it, the Catholic can never get away from the providential view of history. To the eye of faith there is a good and gracious purpose working in all things, and while this purpose may be now obscure, now thwarted, it is in the long run clearly perceptible. St. Paul recognizing the Divinely-appointed function of Greece as laying the intellectual and the esthetic foundation for the Gospel, St. Augustine sweeping the horizon of the "*Civitas Dei*" in Rome's declining days and tracing the hand

of God in the vicissitudes of man, Bossuet in his "Discourse on Universal History," have committed themselves and us to the conception of a celestial plan permeating the record of human activity. Without the Incarnation as its central fact the wondrous tale is naught but "the labor of ants in the gleam of a million million of suns": the *Verbum Caro Factum* gathers up the threads of history and of them weaves the vesture of God.

To trace this plan is no mere academic exercise or pious luxury. A people has its vocation as an individual has. And it can easily happen that the individual soul fails to achieve completely its own destiny through losing sight of the larger rôle of the race. When the Greek no longer seeks after knowledge he not only impedes the Divine plan in general but jeopardizes his personal salvation as well. When the Roman weakens his grasp on law and organization and discipline he will not easily find another sphere in which to develop his energies. Normally, the separation of the personal from the corporate destiny can work only harm; and if the Irish in America have not fulfilled all their promise as a race of true idealists, if they must plead guilty in any measure to the indictment Dr. O'Malley brought against them in the pages of AMERICA last year, it can only be because they have suffered the glamor of material success to blind their eyes to the finer and more delicate glory that is sure to be theirs if they but remain true to themselves.

Perhaps a moment's reflection on the unique character and circumstances of St. Patrick's mission will help us to see all implied in this. Before his day there had been no instance in Western Europe of the extension of Christianity to a people not previously Romanized. Newman's happy dictum that "the Graeco-Roman civilization was the soil in which Christianity grew up" must, in the case of Ireland, admit of an exception which seems providential. The nearest parallel to it is the conversion of the fourth-century Goths; but the Goths became Arians, and their true conversion was delayed until they had fallen under the still potent influence of imperial Rome. In Ireland Christianity was superimposed immediately on the native civilization without the usually intermediate layer of Roman organization. Ireland's conversion was a fusion of two elements, not of three, as was the conversion of other Western peoples up to that time. Consequently the type of Catholicism, if we may use the phrase, was different, the native genius expressing itself far more strongly than among other non-Roman races. The root and the significance of the difference between Celtic Christianity and the Christianity of Saxon Britain and the Continent, a difference so over-worked by a certain school of Anglican historians, are to be sought in the simple fact that Ireland had never been brought under the military sway of Rome. Her religion was from the Eternal City, her culture was from herself.

Now it calls for no particularly deep or lengthy acquaintance with that culture to perceive that one of its

most striking elements is an unusual, some would say uncanny, faculty for realizing the unseen. Fairy tale, legend and myth are, of course, not the exclusive property of any one race, but some races appear to possess a penchant for this sort of thing, and none more so than the Celts. Their attitude toward the invisible world is almost startling in its matter-of-fact realism; Christianity has but changed its objective. In place of the Banshee, the Leprechaun and the "Good People" the converted Irishman put Our Lord and the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. We may go so far as to say that he has really only added these to his already extensive list of spiritual acquaintances, many a story told today on the "Old Sod" being in reality a sort of baptized version of a folk-tale that was ancient before St. Patrick was born. But whatever of latent paganism lingers in the stories of present-day Kerry or Donegal is but a witness, innocent enough, to that tenacity with which the Celtic mind, having once grasped the preternatural or the supernatural, will never let it go.

It is this tenacity, sanctified by grace, that has given to Ireland the unique and transcendent honor of being the only nation in Northern Europe that held out at the Reformation. Everything possible was done to make her Protestant, but the attempt has failed because it rested ultimately on the offer of material advantage in exchange for Heaven, the bartering of the eternal and unseen for the glory that passeth away. The Celt spurned the bargain and never for a moment doubted that even from a purely practical and common-sense point of view he was right. To him the next world is not a mere theory or speculation on which he might be willing to run a risk: it is a fact. He did not only imagine Christ and His Mother: he knew Them, he had a personal acquaintance with Them. And the thought of displeasing them and thereby not enjoying their company in the life beyond was as abhorrent to him as to be separated from his wife and children. Nay, it was more abhorrent, for when necessary he could and did part with all he loved on earth for the sake of a higher love, his inborn faculty for entering into and realizing the truths that transcend reason having fitted him to accept in its full application the Divine lesson "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul?"

Has this power been weakened by contact with American life? Is the transplanted Celt less alive to the invisible than his forefathers? If so it would be one of the supreme tragedies of human history. For never has there been so great a need in our land today as that of a witness to the unseen, and dreadful in sooth would it be if at the very time and place in which he could most effectively fill this rôle the Celt should fail. The whole trend of American life is away from that region in which the mystic Celt is most at home. I am not referring now to the pursuit of luxury and material greatness. That is not a characteristically American weakness, but a trait of human nature the world over, only America happens

to have more temptations that way. What lies at the root of the evils parading themselves among us is that so-called "practical" attitude, a sort of neo-Pelagianism, that exalts human reason and natural powers above the grace of God. Our non-religious schools, our naturalistic ethics, our hyper-reverence for natural virtue, what are these but an attempt to obtain the results of religion without going to the trouble of being religious? If a child misbehaves in school we are told not that he ought to have better home training or a more religious environment, but that he must be sent to the doctor and have an operation for adenoids! Put everything on a natural basis, say nothing about God and the next life or free-will or moral obligation, but ascribe evil exclusively to physical causes, treat crime as a disease, abolish all thought of sin, and if there be a God seek him in man. Analyze this and you will find it is only the old error condemned by Rome fifteen centuries ago, that taught the possibility of salvation without the grace of God. Now it is a striking fact, not at all sufficiently insisted on, that the entrance of Ireland on the stage of Christian history was in protest against that very thing. Palladius, the precursor of Patrick, was sent to Ireland, not to convert pagans to Christianity, but to bring back heretics to orthodoxy. "*Ad Scotos in Christo credentes*" was his commission. It would seem that at the very outset there was an attempt of Satan to divert to naturalism the very race that God emphatically destined to be the champion of supernaturalism. We know little about these pre-Patrician Irish Christians, but we know a great deal about their descendants, and on every page of their history is written the noble record of how through centuries of horrible persecution they abundantly atoned for the momentary lapse in the early fifth century that brought Papal missionaries hurrying to their shores. Amid the murk of selfishness they have kept burning the flame of idealism, and should we, their children in America, suffer the torch to go out we shall be renegade to as sacred a trust as was ever given to a Christian people.

God keep us faithful! As long as men are liable to the bewitchery of trifles, so long will God need loyal souls to stand boldly before the world and point out the folly of attempting to build on any other foundation than Christ. He needs them here and now. Our work as brethren of St. Ita lies ready to hand, for no country requires more the lesson of the supernatural than our own. She possesses an abundant supply of representatives of that race which is of all races the best fitted to impart it. Are they imparting it? What would be St. Ita's judgment on those Irish Catholics who foolishly ape the manners and echo the sentiments of a pagan society into which they yearn for an entrée? If wealth and high station are going to weaken Irish idealism it would be better for all, Irish and non-Irish, that we should jettison every material advantage that immigration has brought us. For if the prophet lose the vision who will declare it to the people?

A Plea for the Contemplative Life

THE ABBOT OF CALDEY

IT is very difficult for most people, and even for some educated Catholics, to believe that the contemplative life has any real or necessary place in the ministry and organization of the Church. Those who are working amid the feverish activity of modern life, sometimes cannot see the wood for the trees; and show themselves to be totally unfamiliar with the causes that govern the existence of such vocations as those of the Carthusian, Cistercian and Benedictine Orders.

In these days the vocation to the purely contemplative life fails to attract and convince, at a time when it is more than ever needed, just because the true aspect of it has been lost in the progress and bustle of workaday life. If men think of it at all, it is rather as the refuge of the melancholy and incompetent who, failing to find a place in the strenuous life of the world, drift into the cloister to make sure at least of personal sanctification. Cloistered contemplation is regarded as selfish luxury worthy of blame rather than praise, in the face of all that has to be done when evils of every kind are ranged against the Church, demanding all the living force of Catholicism to meet and defeat them. It is this habit of setting action against contemplation that is wrong to start with. As a matter of fact, the contemplative life is truly one of action; but it is activity towards God rather than as directly exercised for the good of men: and it is necessary to insist that the contemplative life is essentially a part of the normal life of the Church, not an idle and isolated existence of religious eccentrics.

The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ; and in her ministry and organization she reproduces all the aspects of His mortal life, in order that He who is with us in His Church "all days, even to the consummation of the world" may continue to show forth the example of His holiness, and the miraculous power of His love.

In His human life Our Blessed Lord devoted thirty years to silence, prayer and hidden work; and at most three years were consecrated to public ministrations. Even during this short period we read that He often went apart from His disciples to be alone and pray. In His sacramental life in the Holy Eucharist, upon our altars, He is with us as the Great Contemplative, hidden, silent yet full of activity, bringing God to man with the strong energy of His love, and kindling in man the desire and determination to reach out to God.

It is thus in the following of Christ that the contemplative Orders have the sure and only reasons for their existence. They do not belong to the Hierarchy of the Church, but they are an integral part of her constitution and essence, for they help to show forth the complete life of Christ to the world, and the will of her Founder has assigned to them an incontestable mission.

In the first ages of the great persecutions in the

Church, the lives of the contemplatives were hidden in the conflicts of the Martyrs; and effaced by the visible representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary, in the suffering of the individual members of Christ's Mystical Body. But when the days of persecution were over a new kind of martyr arose who offered his life, not in the bloody conflict of the arena, but in the lauras of Egypt and Palestine, in the monasteries of Greece, and later, in those of Western Europe. He offered his life not only to fulfil the Passion and the Sacrifice of Christ on Golgotha, but also to live over again the silent, solitary years at Nazareth. For many centuries all exterior work was forbidden to the monk. It was realized that nothing was needed to supplement the value of his penance, and the power of his prayers. Even a superficial study of monasticism shows one that, as a general rule, any departure from the first fervor of observance was usually the result of devotion to external work and the consequent neglect of cloister and interior life. Roughly speaking, from the sixth to the eleventh centuries, by far the greatest part of evangelical, missionary and educational work was done by the monks; and it is well known that all modern learning and civilization originated in the large and capable communities of devoted servants of God. But while Martha was busy, Mary's witness was not lacking; and there never was a time when the contemplative vocation—the sitting at His feet—found no place in the life of the Church. Time after time great reformers arose to build again the cloister walls, and to drive back from the sanctuary the incursions of the world. There is a long list of mighty witnesses to the paramount need of prayer and penance. Benedict, Columban, Bernard, Romuald and Bruno were followed by a host of disciples and spiritual children, who peopled anew the wilderness and the solitary places of the earth, and fled from the face of men to dwell alone with God. Thus always the great need of the Church and of our human and spiritual nature has been met; and the contemplative Orders find their subjects at all times and in all places of Christian life. Here one man, a leader, there a handful of like-minded men and women, rise up out of the mass and give their message, and light the torch to be handed on till the flame burns low and it is kindled again.

Each contemplative is born at Bethlehem; effaces himself and his origin in the Nazareth of the cloister with its silence, enclosure and voluntary penance; is crucified at Calvary by the cross laid upon him by his rule and observances, and finally unites himself with the Eucharistic life of His Master and Brother by his prayer, which ascends seven times a day before the altar, the official supplication and homage offered to God in his person and life "filling up those things which are wanting of the sufferings of Christ."

Surely this action of the contemplative in prayer, and penance, and silence is a great and true action; an activity more efficacious and fruitful because of its source in God, and more far-reaching than many external works, on ac-

count of its freedom from the limitations of time and space. It is the work of Him who "always liveth to make intercession for us." Looking at God, obeying God, loving God, and from God drawing, as from a fountain, the healing waters of mercy and peace for the weary toil-stained children of men. The prayer of the contemplative is our Lord's Own Prayer that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven.

A visitor called one day at a Carthusian monastery and asked to be allowed to see one of the monks, an old friend of his, who had been an energetic priest in the mission field. He passed through the long quiet cloisters, saw his friend in his hermitage, and asked him what he did all day long:

"I am still doing mission work," he replied. "My activity in bygone days was limited to a single region; but now the whole world is open to my zeal, and by my prayer and life I can touch the heart of the most distant savage in Africa and the Islands of the Southern Seas."

The activity of contemplation may be likened to the dynamos and storage batteries of some vast power-station, generating a force which can encircle the world, a force bounded by no physical obstacles, beside which the latest discoveries of wireless telegraphy, x-rays and radium sink into insignificance. Here are some words of Mgr. Turinaz in answer to the question, "What do contemplatives do?"

They are above our great cities where vice displays itself openly. One may compare them to a lightning conductor which wards off the threatened danger in a storm. They expiate for you. They ransom your souls held prisoners by pleasures, enslaved in sensuality, mastered by selfishness. Tomorrow if their prayers ceased, if their uplifted hands fell discouraged to the ground, if they forsook the ways of penitence, the world, like a whisp of straw, would be swept away by the fury of the tempest of God's vengeance.

It is very easy to lose a sense of proportion, especially if one is absorbed by external works; but all who have any real experience of life know how little can be done by human means alone. There will always be the many to live and work in the world, and it must not be grudged to the few to go apart from the world, to be in it, yet not of it. The life of the Church is a whole, a beautiful and proportionate growth, not an ugly one-sided mis-shapen development. Let those who can, and who are called, strive in prayer on the mountain top for those who struggle and fight in the valley below.

The strong plea for the contemplative Orders today is that they can and do provide the necessary balance in the struggle and rush of work and strife. Even spiritual activity tends to become weakened and dissipated, and just as Martha and Mary were each loved by Our Lord and had each her work and place, so the active and contemplative Orders help support and complement each other, presenting to the world the mystical life of Christ as a whole in its hidden and missionary aspects. The active religious has multiple duties claiming his best efforts in the confes-

sional, the pulpit, the school, the hospital, and the press. The contemplative, no less occupied, his activity more limited by the confines of his monastery, is free to concentrate his energies in the practice of prayer and penance. The active goes out to seek; the contemplative is sought. The active raises the fallen in the street; the contemplative extends the welcome of peace and help to those who knock at his door. The one is the purveyor of spiritual goods; the other is the storehouse from which supplies may be drawn. The arm of the flesh and the sword of the spirit, the preaching of the Word and the prayer of adoration, the visible and the sacramental, the active and the contemplative, each in God's way doing God's will ministering to His glory and the salvation of souls.

Donozo Cortes wrote in 1849:

I believe that those who pray do more for the world than those who fight; and if the world goes from bad to worse, it is because there are more battles than prayers. If we could penetrate into the mind of God, and into the secret that lies behind all history, I am sure that we should be utterly astonished at the disproportionate value of prayer, even in merely ordinary every-day human affairs. In order that mankind may be at peace, it is necessary that there should be a certain balance which God alone can understand, between prayer and action, between the contemplative and the active life. I am completely convinced that if the moment were to come when prayer had utterly ceased, when no voice, no aspiration of the soul were raised to God, that moment would be the end of the world.

In this Donozo Cortes presents a supreme justification for contemplative Orders.

The State and Property

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

THE question of ownership is obviously the most fundamental of our economic problems. Directly or indirectly it affects every human being. Hence the far-reaching consequences of false popular theories in this regard. The definition itself of ownership is sufficiently clear. It implies the full right of disposing of an object, in so far as the law permits. The right of property is described by Blackstone as "The free use, enjoyment and disposal of all acquisitions, without any control or diminution, save only by the laws of the land." When justice and charity have been considered, as religion demands, there is but one other factor that can limit a man's free use and disposal of his own possessions, and that is the power of the State.

Yet this fact does not imply any rights of ownership on the part of the State over the private property of individuals, families, organizations or societies. The false doctrine that all ownership is due to the law of the State, and therefore can be annulled or changed at the pleasure of the State, or by a majority of voters at the ballot box, became a favorite principle of Socialism.

Hence, too, the consequence drawn by Socialists, that not merely the confiscation of the productive property of citizens, but likewise the offering or refusal of any payment in compensation for it, are purely matters of expediency to be determined at the will and whim of a victorious proletariat. This would logically follow if the right of ownership were conferred by the State and held at its good pleasure only. As the law alone had created this right by an arbitrary edict, so the law could take away the property of citizens, confiscate it without any "by your leave," without offering a penny in compensation. Such are the intensely practical consequences, sufficient to overturn all civilization, that flow from a single philosophical error touching upon this important question. The weal or wo of the world is determined far more than men realize by the theorist and the philosopher.

In justice it should be said that the false principles of radicalism are usually derived from rationalistic capitalism. The new economic liberalism which sprang from the Reformation little realized that in casting aside the social teachings of the Church, together with her Divinely-given authority, and substituting its own standards of greed, it was playing with a two-edged sword. It utilized the power of the State to sweep away the rights of the masses and impose upon them a yoke "little better than slavery." The same power is now conveniently invoked by the new radicalism in an effort to impose upon capital and labor alike a political tyranny which would prove as galling and bitter as capitalism had ever been in its worst excesses.

The doctrine that private property owes its existence to the laws of the State was propounded by Hobbes in his "Leviathan." All other rights of citizens were derived by him from the same source. From England the false theory passed into France and Germany. Destructive of practically all natural rights, it became an excellent justification for the aberrations of Socialists and communists. Nothing but the law now stood between the property-holder and his possessions. Change the law and you change the owner. Such is the Socialist doctrine today. Churches and private schools, as well as land and factories, can on the morrow be arbitrarily taken by the State and applied to its own uses or distributed among new owners. No injustice is done and no complaint can be made. It all follows from the one false principle. Atheistic capitalists hardly dared to act up to the full possibilities of their own principles, but men of the Bolshevik and Socialist type are not to be deterred from pushing their theories to their logical consequences.

Catholic doctrine, on the contrary, teaches that as the individual and the family precede the State, so their rights, including that of ownership, are prior to the State. They cannot, therefore, be derived from it. Men do not

exist for the State; but the State exists for the individuals and families within its care. Its function is to guard their individual rights and to harmonize them with the general welfare. The State neither creates nor confers them. Private owners, therefore, may use and dispose of their property, freely and without any interference on the part of the State, except only in so far as the social order and the public good are affected. Just here for the first time the power of the State enters, not however by virtue of any rights of ownership which the State is presumed to possess, but solely by virtue of its power of jurisdiction. This distinction must be carefully noted, since it underlies all that can be said upon this important subject.

The significance of this principle is plain at once. Since the State has no rights of ownership over any private possessions, held individually or corporately by its citizens, it follows that the State cannot dispose of one foot of private land or one penny of private wealth according to its own arbitrary will and pleasure, even should that will and pleasure be expressed through the ballot box, by a majority of Socialist voters. They, no more than czar and emperor, can claim the right of ownership over the private possessions of citizens. It matters not whether these possessions consist of a boy's whipping-top or of the latest factory built by Ford. The principle is absolute and there is no exception.

Yet though the State has no rights of ownership over private property, it has rights of jurisdiction. It cannot dispose at its pleasure or for its own interests of any private possessions, for this would imply ownership, but it can and must exercise its power so far as the general welfare requires, and no further. For this the State has been instituted, that it may consult and safeguard the common good.

"The temporal goods which God commits to a man are his indeed in regard to property," says St. Thomas, "but in regard to use they are not his alone, but others also who can be sustained by what is superfluous for him." If the individual owner neglects his social responsibilities, it is the duty of the State to enforce their observance. But often it may be difficult for the individual correctly to perceive these obligations. In general, too, many of these obligations cannot be wisely carried out except by subordination to some governing authority which regulates them. Hence the rightfulness of the imposition of special income taxes, of the assumption of public ownership in certain particular fields, and of all similar measures enacted in conformity with the general welfare. In none of these instances is the State usurping the rights of ownership, provided it is guided solely by the common good. Its laws, however, must take into account the well-being of all classes. No more than the just burdens should be placed upon the shoulders of property-owners, and Socialistic confiscation is always unjust.

The correct relation of the individual and of the State to the possession of private property can be briefly stated. The right of acquiring private property belongs by nature

to every man. Because man alone of all animate creation is gifted with reason, he must have the right to provide for the future as well as for the present moment. This he does by the acquisition of stable and permanent possessions. "Hence man can possess not only the fruits of the earth, but also the earth itself; for of the products of the earth he can make provision for the future." This right, as Pope Leo XIII adds, is not given him by the State, but is prior to the State:

Man is older than the State, and he holds the right of providing for the life of his body prior to the formation of any State. And to say that God has given the earth to the use and enjoyment of the whole human race is not to deny that there can be private property. For God has granted the earth to mankind in general; not in the sense that all without distinction can do with it as they please, but rather that no part of it has been assigned to any one in particular, and that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man's own industry and the laws of individual peoples.—(*The Condition of Labor.*)

While therefore the right of acquiring property is derived from nature and not from the State, the actual acquisition of private property is not determined by nature, but depends upon external facts, such as mere occupancy in the beginning. Moreover the jurisdictional power of the State is lawfully invoked to limit and regulate the rights of ownership that they may be made to harmonize with the general welfare. Such action became particularly necessary when all the land had already passed into private and public possession. Those, however, who held no private title to the land had likewise by nature a right to live from the fruits of the land. It was the duty of the State to see that all were provided from this common storehouse. Hence again the duty of the State to regulate the privileges of private ownership, so that no one, who duly performs his allotted task in life, may be excluded from the reasonable use and enjoyment of what God has made for all mankind.

Moreover, the earth, though divided among private owners, ceases not therefore to minister to the needs of all, for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil contribute by their labor; so that it may be truly said that all human subsistence is derived either from labor on one's own land, or from some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land brings forth.—(*The Condition of Labor.*)

The State therefore, to resume the argument, has no rights of ownership over private property, whether this consists of land or of the industries which convert into manufactured products the raw materials drawn from the earth. But it has both the right and the duty of exercising jurisdictional power over every form of private ownership the moment the latter affects the general welfare. Yet the extent of all State action in this regard must be strictly limited by the demands of the common good. While public ownership in certain public service utilities may be desirable, according to national or local conditions, the main tendency of legislation should be to enable as

many as possible to become private owners of productive property in land or shares. Hence all true legislation will be equally opposed to Socialism, which would withdraw ownership from individuals to confer it on the commonwealth; and to rationalistic capitalism, which would concentrate it in the hands of a few. Such, in brief, is the Christian ideal as expressed in the teachings of the Holy See.

John E. Redmond

J. C. WALSH

IT has always seemed to me that, if we feel we have the right to pass judgment upon the acts of an Irish statesman, we ought to consider, as he has to consider, the two phases of his work, for there are two. He has to carry on a struggle against England in England's capacity as a foreign power ruling Ireland in England's interest and against Ireland's interest; and he has to convince the Irish people that every move he makes is the right move. The conditions in which his work has to be done are constant only in the constancy of change, of change in men to be dealt with, of change in circumstances of which advantage may be taken, of change in the tactics to be adopted to the end that there may be always gain. No man can command all events to his liking, and by temperament Mr. Redmond was the last man to complain if, when he had acted according to the best of his judgment, events caused his calculations to miscarry. In the last four years, in which he must have suffered keenly and constantly, bitter words escaped him but twice, once when he believed the fruits of patient statesmanship had been thrown away by the act of the young men in Dublin, and once when he told the rulers of England that when he sought to bring Ireland honorably to their aid in their great trial he had been by them "let down and betrayed." For the first and only time he had lost his game in London and had lost his game in Dublin. Like the good player he was, he went calmly on to the next game. We shall learn, when the report of the Convention comes in, whether he won or lost, or whether the reaper took him before the game was played out. But whether he won or whether he lost, this much is certain: Whoever succeeds him as leader of the Irish people will have to take up the game where he left it, and play it through with varying fortunes just as he did, for his death does nothing to change the basic problems of leadership, which take rise on the maturing of new generations of Irish men and women righteously intolerant of foreign rule and of the persistence of England's inherent and seemingly ineradicable tendency to treat Ireland as an alien and essentially a hostile country, whose people are to be maintained in a real, if disguised, subjection. That was the problem of Grattan, of O'Connell, of Parnell and of Redmond, as it will be the problem of Dillon, Devlin, De Valera or whoever may be the man of the new day and the new generation. However lightly the rest of us may ignore the elements of the situation, no leader of Ireland can escape them. The new leader perforce accepts the position as the earlier leader left it.

In an earlier and more auspicious hour, Mr. Redmond was a beneficiary of this element of permanence and continuity, for it is the Land Act, by whose agency the Irish people got back their land and laid the foundations of economic strength, that will be linked with his name in history, and it was the work of Davitt and Parnell, long before, which had made the Land Act possible. The generation which has grown to manhood since 1903 knows nothing, at least it knows nothing by experience, of the helplessness of the people in 1878, nor can it realize how fantastic and impracticable appeared the demand

that Davitt made when Davitt made it. The critical battles in that great warfare were fought by men who were in the depths of destitution, who had all the odds against them, who had been treated as serfs all their lives as their fathers were before them, and who had between themselves and destruction only the intrepid spirits of Parnell and Davitt and the sustaining generosity of the Irish in America. There came a day when Mr. Redmond felt he could say to one of his lieutenants that if there was a strong agitation that winter he believed the land could be won for the people. There was an agitation; the lieutenant spent much of the winter in jail, that favored rostrum of Irish right; and the land was won for the people. That was John Redmond's great hour. He had what seemed to be another on that afternoon in May, 1914, when the Home Rule Act, now safe at last from the enmity of the Lords, was carried across to them from the Commons through corridors crowded by young Irishmen singing "A Nation Once Again." It looked as though he was to complete the program of Parnell as well as the program of Davitt. The cup was at the lip. Now it will be for some other leader to complete the work of Redmond. There is nothing in the future more certain than that it will be done. The event only awaits the determining occasion.

One other achievement of the impossible stands to his credit. Mr. Balfour, in office, admitting the complete justice of the case for an Irish university into which Catholics might enter without sacrifice either of faith or of self-respect, pronounced the institution of such a university impossible in the presence of bigotry's antagonism. Mr. Redmond waited, and in time he got the university from Mr. Birrell.

For a long time, probably, people will continue to judge Mr. Redmond by his action during the war. There can be no proper objection to that, and he would be the last to complain even of disapproval. What perhaps is worth while is an honest effort to understand his action. After Parnell's death, he had fought his way to the front, and the fighting was bitter, in support of the principle that Ireland could not place her dependence upon the good will of English statesmen. During many years he had made gain after gain for Ireland by playing off one English statesman, or group of statesmen, against another. In the final stages of the Home Rule contest, gusts of treachery were forever blowing up from some new corner. He knew how Loveburn, apparently a tried friend, had broken the solidarity of the Liberals. He knew how Lloyd George, with Asquith's approval, had sprung upon him the trap of partition. He knew how Asquith had handled the mutiny of officers at the Curragh. And he knew how the law had closed its eyes to Carson's gun running. He knew he was surrounded with deception, and yet he elected, when the war came, to trust England and to assent to the postponement of Home Rule. It seems to me he must have done it with his eyes open, that he had studied the ground, which none knew better, that he made his election in the belief that he was choosing aright for Ireland, and that the risks he took were as patent to him as they have since been to the severest of his critics. If he guessed wrong, so did Joffre when he threw his armies into Alsace, so did the British Cabinet, when it counted on a victory in three months, so did Sazonof when he headed the Russian steam roller for Berlin. Probably we shall learn some time that the miscalculations were all one and the same. The firmest friends of the Irish cause in the British Cabinet were convinced of victory in a few months. The wonder would have been if Redmond had reached any different conclusion. Only Kitchener did, and he spoke not in the first days of August, but in the last days of September. To the extent that Redmond erred he paid, and, as time goes on, it is the other phase of the error that will increase in significance. It was the same Redmond who, during the Boer War, had refused to associate Ireland

with England's war. The world was told then that if Ireland had acted otherwise Ireland could have anything from a grateful England. This time Redmond took Ireland into England's war, into a life and death struggle, and England's answer was to deceive and humiliate Redmond, to insult and dragoon Ireland, to foment a rebellion and to repress a people over-eager to be friendly and helpful. Mr. Redmond bore without complaining the odium of his error. Mr. Asquith's idea of bearing England's share of blame for the failure of the great experiment was to taunt Mr. Redmond with the resulting loss of prestige in Ireland. In the calmer times ahead all this will come up for mature and reasoned appreciation. All that need be said now is that the lines are more clearly marked for the guidance of whoever is next to lead the Irish fight for government with the consent of the governed.

That phase Mr. Redmond was fated not to see. Like the leader of Israel, he saw it only from the mountain near by the promised land, how near we are not yet to know. What we are free to suspect is that, knowing himself stricken, he deferred for many months to seize his chance for a restoration of health lest by his absence the one chance there seemed to be to carry Ireland a long step on her way might be impaired. I confess I cannot find it in my heart to grieve when one who with heart and head has played his part to the last hour goes to join his fathers with his knight's harness on. The new generation, which he had to ask to wait and which could not wait for him, must fill his place. Let us hope their choice may measure up to his stature, for what remains to be done is still a great and difficult work, calling for the highest there is of character and courage in Ireland's service.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should be limited to six-hundred words.

White Slavery: A Reply

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"Furthermore, I submit that to hold that we may not cooperate with non-Catholic citizens towards the common good in matters of morals for fear of scandal is rank bigotry and not holiness": With this ponderously pompous and forensic thud the gage of J. S. L., of Buffalo, descended on the field of combat, in AMERICA for February 2, thereby adding to the already considerable cloud of dust which for more than a column's space he had been assiduously engaged in raising. Whereupon, without deigning to argue the point at all, under the kindly shelter of his three initials, he abruptly retired from the lists, leaving the combatants on either side sorely perplexed as to which of them he intended to befriend. His thesis favored one side, his arguments the other; he proved the crying need of cooperating with non-Catholic agencies by showing how Catholic resources, if properly utilized, were more than sufficient to accomplish all important social work that Catholics have time or money or zeal to do. Our friend, C. Connolly, must have been as well satisfied with J. S. L.'s invaluable support as Balak was with the prophecies of Balaam.

To avoid further confusion, it may be well to restate the question at issue. Mr. C. Connolly's original contention was that, by neglecting to adopt the programs of non-Catholic reform agencies and by failing to support, financially and otherwise, their movements for social uplift, the Catholic clergy and laity were gravely derelict to duty. By implication Mr. Connolly condemned the Catholic social program, pronounced Catholic measures and methods inefficient, called into question the wisdom of the Church's attitude towards modern problems, and virtually denied that she was properly fulfilling, at least here in America, her mission to society as the true and only guardian by Divine appointment of morals as well as faith. He may say in reply that he criticized Catholics and not the

Church. To this I answer that, by contrasting Catholics with non-Catholics, he criticized the Catholic clergy and laity in that sense in which they are identified with the Church. Now so to criticize the Church, especially when the matter borders closely on morality, and when the critic has nothing but admiration for the specious efficiency of non-Catholics in the same field, constitutes to my mind a breach of loyalty. In morals as in faith, the wisdom of the Church is supreme both as to the standards of conduct and the methods of teaching them to men. To proceed in such matters without her approval is rash; to go outside for light and guidance is not merely folly, it is sheer lack of loyalty, which invites certain failure of the enterprise and even shipwreck of faith itself.

But, as Father Blakely pointed out, such criticism is due even more to ignorance than to disloyalty. Ignorance of Catholic things among non-Catholics is simply appalling, but some Catholics seem to be almost in the same predicament. They do not appear to know, for instance, that the Catholic Church has a definite social program, approved and furthered by her entire hierarchy, with certain agencies organized to carry out its several parts. Unfortunately, however, these agencies suffer from malnutrition of membership. The Catholics who wish to cooperate with non-Catholic agencies would apparently rather die than join them, much less work enthusiastically for them, I speak of the Catholic Federation, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, etc., etc. These societies they prefer to criticize, those they cease not to admire. Yet, meanwhile, the fields are white for the harvest, and the laborers in the Catholic organizations are few; and the upshot of it all is that a social and moral program more perfect, efficacious and sublime than any non-Catholic organization ever dreamed of, remains nothing more than a program. Why? Is it because the Bishops and priests fail to exhort the Faithful to join, or actively and financially support, these movements and organizations? No, but mainly because of the canker of worldliness which eats into the very vitals of faith, kills the zeal of the lay Catholic, makes him ashamed of things distinctively Catholic, a critic of his Church, and a worshiper at other shrines.

This social program of the Church is embodied in that of the Catholic Federation, which calls upon the Catholic laymen in every city of any size in this country to assist its campaign for securing, among other things, three very practical and essential objects: (1) The purging of theatricals, literature, films, etc., from moral filth; (2) a living wage for workers, both men and women; (3) higher education for Catholic young men. At first sight, and to the superficial mind, these measures may not seem to constitute an issue at all comparable with that of a vice crusade. To the thoughtful, however, who seek for remedies that go to the very roots of evil and do not merely salve the surface, it soon becomes apparent that the former aims are worthy of the most devoted service, while the crusade against cadets and white-slavers is, on the whole—that is, as long as nothing is done to eliminate the causes and conditions which make possible such hideous immorality—a waste of valuable time. English and French officers from the western front inform us that owing to the number of wounded and the consequent congestion of hospitals in Europe, it becomes necessary to discriminate among the wounded; those who have received wounds from bullets or shrapnel are taken to the hospital, but those who have received a bayonet-wound are given "first aid" and then passed over, because it is futile to waste on such the attention that will save life elsewhere. Similarly, modern society presents the appearance of a battle-ground littered with the victims of sin. So stupendous is the task of rescue that, if anything is to be accomplished, there must be more specialization and less sentimentality. When vice has reached the white-slavery stage, it is almost too late to talk of remedies. We must begin our efforts at the other end

of the process, by destroying the causes. I do not for a moment approve of that attitude which allows vice and its promoters to go unpunished; indeed, no one is a good Catholic, or even a good citizen, who does not use his influence to have the laws against vice enforced, but to rely on mere punishment as an efficient means of reform is an expedient as pitiable as the attempt to cure a cancer by the application of ointment.

The measures set forth in the Catholic social program are, on the contrary, real and not makeshift remedies. Fill our legislatures, executive boards, professions, etc., with educated Catholics, and Catholic moral standards will prevail. But as long as Catholics neglect, as they do, the exhortations of their pastors to send their boys to Catholic high schools and colleges, so long, in spite of numbers, shall we remain social non-entities, so long will the destinies of the nation be exclusively in the hands of men who lack correct moral principles. Engaged in the work of purifying the theater, films and literature of the nation we see only the Catholic Federation unassisted by any "evangelical" crusaders. There is nothing sensational about this work, the press does not commend it, it lacks the "band wagon" and the "tom-tom," there is, above all, no compensation in it for indigent "social experts," and so the Catholics, so far as they have zeal to utilize it, naturally have the field to themselves. Yet the pollution of the imagination and the mind has its necessary corollary, the pollution of the body. Not merely moralists, but infidel psychologists will tell you this. Lastly, to deny our workingmen and girls the compensation justly due them for their services to society by refusing them a living wage, is to turn their homes into cheerless hovels, to drive men to drink and degraded amusement and to tempt women to the bartering of their virtue.

My aversion to all "evangelical" methods of reform is due not to "rank bigotry" but to common-sense and experience. There is no common ground for cooperation with non-Catholic organizations of an ethical or religious nature, though Catholics may and should cooperate with civic organizations and with non-Catholics as individuals. Our eternal and unchanging standards of right and wrong must not be subordinated to their shifting and fanatical fads. When we join hands with them to cleanse the theater, it is usual to find that we have been inveigled into a movement to suppress Sunday baseball or some other piece of tom-foolery, which makes the whole affair ridiculous. On the other hand, they see no harm in the things we condemn, as I experienced, on one occasion, when I attempted in vain to secure the cooperation of the ministers in a certain town of Ohio, to have the Mayor issue an order for the removal of some vile posters from the boards of the principal streets. One of them made a joke of the affair, and all of them seemed to think me quite competent to take care of the matter without their assistance. At all events, no one except myself made any protest to the Mayor. Hence it would seem that where standards based on faith or morals are concerned, cooperation is impossible for the difference of viewpoint goes back to first principles.

Beatty, Pa.

BARRY O'TOOLE.

[This correspondence is now closed.—ED. AMERICA.]

Some Irish, Old and New

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Why slur the names of Americans of Dutch or Gaelic blood who "ape the English" in those things in which the last named are worthy of imitation? "L. J." in AMERICA for February 9, should not let old prejudices blind him. Perhaps he dislikes the English-cut clothes, which are the style even in New Hampshire. We Irish could learn some profitable lessons from English self-restraint, perseverance and devotedness to a cause. More English *savoir faire* would help the Gaels socially.

A few examples will illustrate my former letter urging the educated Irish-Americans to guide the uneducated Irish-Americans to apostolic achievements. Old English families, no matter what their failings, generally have a tradition. Frequently that tradition bequeaths the self-imposed obligation of doing something worth while for "humanity," especially English humanity. Now, I realize that they have followed bad philosophies; that they have ignored the Irish. The point, however, is that the Irish-American families, who until recently have been totally engrossed in money-making, should look up the traditions of their fathers in the Faith, who possessed a good, sound philosophy, and who loved the Irish. Then they, as leading Catholic families, might go and do likewise, not working for a vague "humanity," but for the temporal and eternal welfare of their fellow-men and for a moral America.

The old English aristocrats were often highly educated. Many of them in every generation have tried to improve the condition of the poorly educated English. They failed more for want of Catholic Sacraments and ethics than from insincerity. Irish-Americans, who try to scintillate socially, are often poorly educated. Their ignorance is especially pathetic, where religion and philosophy are discussed. Moreover, they do not try to reach and elevate their less opulent kindred, because they themselves are looking up. They try to climb into social circles, where they are not wanted. They forget, rather they do not know, that in their religion, its literature and art, they have greater cultural opportunities than their neighbors. Every fundamental principle that America is now fighting for, Irish Catholics have fought for since the battle of the Yellow Ford.

We can and should make enthusiastic speeches on the stage and off it, about our Catholic heritage. Such boasting is not self-praise, but the glorification of Christian principles. Well-to-do Irish Catholic men and women should be satisfied with their own society. They would be very happy enjoying their own company, and their Catholic inheritance in art and philosophy. They would gain the respect of the rest of America by instructing it in Catholic glories.

Baltimore.

G. O'N.

Florence Nightingale's Opinion of Orange Ulster

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In Shane Leslie's "Forgotten Passages in the Life of Florence Nightingale," contributed to the October, 1917, *Dublin Review*, there is further and very conclusive evidence that Miss Nightingale was indebted to Catholic influence, example and training for the foundations of her career as the patron of the modern humanitarian nursing cult. There is also a curious, and, just at present, most interesting, outline of the impression Orange Ulster made on her. Writing on August 20, 1852, she says:

Of all places that the eye of me would not have visited, I think Belfast is the one. Imagine a new, commercial Orange Presbyterian town, a cross between Geneva and Manchester, inhabited by that anomalous animal, an Irish Protestant, with infirmaries, poorhouses, etc., all on the model of London. I have had moments of intense discouragement in my life, but never anything like this.

And in another letter written on September 7, 1852:

I have seen everything in this place and Lisburn and the towns about. And never did I see nursing, education, and all the works of love practised as a *trade* to such an extent before. London is comparatively a little child. To see the craft carried to its perfection you must come here.

More than sixty years have passed since this was written, but, judging from the social situation in Ulster today, in spite of all the progress the world has made elsewhere, Florence Nightingale would have to repeat her avowal of disgust could she revisit this benighted sector of the Green Isle.

Newark, N. J.

H. H. S.

An Irish Lad

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Reading recent communications in AMERICA, I have been reminded forcibly of an incident which took place in an Irish country-school in Ballivor, Co. Meath, in the year 1837. The teacher was at the same time the sexton in the Anglican church, which was situated near by. Schools were rare in Ireland in those days, and of Catholic common-schools there were none. But the love of the Irish for learning impelled them to send their children, in spite of scruples, to the Protestant schools. One day a plump, little eight-year-old boy, rambling in from a small farm a mile away, took his place among the scholars. His family was of the class of small farmers or cottiers who constituted the chief element in the population of Meath, which was almost entirely Catholic. At that time Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, known for the rhetoric which bears his name, was intent on perverting the children of Catholic parents; so he ordered that all the pupils should say the Protestant prayers with the teacher at the opening and closing of the school sessions.

The teacher began the Lord's Prayer, which the little peasant recited after him until he came to the addition, inserted at the end: "For Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory." At this point the boy stuck his fingers into his ears and would neither say nor listen to the false addition, now recognized as such by the more enlightened Church of England. The teacher saw the boy's action and called him up and publicly whipped him on the palms of both hands with a leather strap. The boy shed no tears, and he persisted in refusing to say the prayers. When the little fellow went home, his mother took him to the parish priest, who blessed him for his courage and faith. Once more he went to the same school, and once again refused to say the false prayers; he was again beaten for his loyalty and his faith. He never went back to that school. Soon his whole family, the boy with them, emigrated to the United States, where they all succeeded and stanchly held to the creed of their ancestors. Of the entire family, which was a large one, only that boy is alive today. He is an old man, now as ever a loyal Catholic.

New York.

M. B.

A Catholic Daily Paper

To the Editor of AMERICA:

When the subject of a Catholic daily paper was being discussed in the columns of your paper about a year ago, the writer, a sixty-dollar-a-month clerk, talked about it with men in the same line of work. Nearly all these men are anxious to see such a paper started in Chicago, and here are just a few of their reasons:

We believe Dr. Walsh could edit a health department better than any doctor now writing for any Chicago paper. We want besides a man who can fill a column without telling us that Mr. Arthur Balfour is a man of perhaps the greatest intellect since Newton, and that the latest peace effort, referring to the Pope's peace proposal, has "an odor of limburger." The columnist who writes this trash is the greatest individual molder of public opinion in Chicago. He has convinced more than one Catholic of my acquaintance that Gibbon is an infallible historian.

We want a musical critic, who will refrain from placing John McCormack in the twenty-five-cent-vaudeville class. The most quoted musical critic in Chicago will never forgive the Irish Catholics for not taking the "Play Boy of the Western World" to their hearts. We want a "Guidepost Column" conducted by some one of the type of Mr. Michael Williams, who understands the Catholic position on economic questions and who is in sympathy with the common people. We like the way the *Herald* handles religious questions, but it is too much to expect the feature writers on the big dailies to know anything about

Catholic principles. We would rather have John Talbot Smith's opinion of the New York stage than Burns Mantel's. We appreciate the fact that the local dramatic critics are, as a rule, fair with Catholics, but they have different moral standards and they commend plays that a Catholic critic could not commend. We want some one to write on science who will not insist that the world is billions of years old and that man has evolved from a tadpole. We want some one to answer Arthur Brisbane when he makes fun of Christians.

We want more from the pen of Mary Synon, Spearman, Bazin, Conrad, Ascough, Connolly, Joyce and Aline Kilmer, O'Malley, Walsh, Pallen, Ryan, Belloc, Chesterton, Leslie and others like them, and less of Shaw, Wells, Galsworthy, *New Republic* experts, and best-sellers.

Why does not some man of means, who is interested in this subject, have one of the large cities solicited for both stock and subscriptions for a Catholic daily, to be started in case enough people are found to be interested. It would not cost a fortune and I believe it would prove beyond a doubt that the Catholic people want a daily and will support it.

Chicago.

CHARLES V. HIGGINS.

The "Saturday Evening Post"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As you know, I called your attention to an article on the Red Cross in Italy, by Elizabeth Frazer, in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 9. To this you responded with a magnificent editorial in your issue of February 23. On February 22 I wrote the editor of the *Saturday Evening Post* as follows:

To the Editor of "Saturday Evening Post":

I read with disgust and indignation an article called "The Red Cross in Italy," by Miss Elizabeth Frazer, in your issue of February 9, 1918. Hoping he would call your attention to these deliberate lies that have been officially denied by Italian Government representatives, concerning the Pope, the Italian Catholic clergy and the Catholic Church, I wrote the editor of AMERICA, an able weekly, published in New York City. Should the editor of AMERICA not have called your attention to this calumny, I trust you will procure a copy of that paper, dated February 23, which contains an editorial on this subject. When in error even a newspaper can have the manliness to tender a prompt and complete apology; in this case, not only to the Holy Father but to the Catholics of Italy and of the world.

Yours truly,

E. P. BARRY.

On February 27 I received the following answer:

Editorial Rooms,

"Saturday Evening Post,"

The Curtis Publishing Company.

George Horace Lorimer, Editor.

Philadelphia, February 25, 1918.

Dear Sir: You have apparently read something into Miss Frazer's article which she did not say or intend to intimate. As we read the passage, she simply suggests that the Austrians were misquoting the Pope in an effort to influence the Italians by a poisonous propaganda.

You can rest assured that in publishing this article the *Saturday Evening Post* was not actuated by any religious bias or prejudice, nor, in fact, did we suppose that it would be construed, even remotely, as an attack on any religion or religious organization.

Very truly yours,

THE EDITOR.

Mr. E. P. Barry.

L—H.

When I read this effusion I could hardly believe my own eyes. That the editor of a paper of such high literary standing should make deliberately such a statement does not speak very highly for his knowledge of the English language. I do not think this matter should be allowed to rest with any such stuff. If these people are sincere they will repudiate the Frazer statement.

Baltimore.

E. P. BARRY.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 178 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Dogma and Some Clerics

FEW phenomena so afflict the soul with weariness as clergymen who "preach" on anything and everything except the Gospel. As a glance at the Saturday newspapers will show, New York is full of these gentlemen, and they have imitators in every American city. One of these men, a stern critic of the untruthful and wily Jesuits, discoursed to an admiring congregation lately on "Airplanes and Angels," while others have been known to expatiate on subjects varying from the price of winter wheat to a defense of such "Christians" as deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ. These clerics have nothing new to say. The point of importance, therefore, is to give to their banalities an environment as noisy as a boiler factory, as glaring as the band wagon at the head of a circus parade.

Several of these clerical showmen chose the second Sunday in Lent to present in public the frayed and venerable pronouncement that deed, not creed, is important, and that if a man leads a good life it matters not what he believes. That the pronouncement was itself a "creed" did not occur to these gentlemen, who, in truth, have little power of self-criticism. A dogma, in a general sense, is a truth properly enunciated, and a religious dogma is a truth proposed for acceptance by competent religious authority. It is obvious that no honest, no intelligent man can be indifferent to the truth. The intellect is so constituted that its goal is the attainment of the truth, and it is a disordered or a dishonest mind that accepts with equal readiness truth or falsehood. Furthermore, every man, acting intelligently, initiates, guides and completes his actions according to certain principles which he firmly believes to be true. That is, his "deed" is ruled by his "creed," his acts are based on "dogma."

Inevitable as dogma is, from the standpoint of psychology, even a brief acquaintance with the Gospels must show its necessary place in the life of every Christian. If one thing is clear from the study of these sacred records, it is that Our Blessed Lord taught a definite

"creed," which He imposed upon all who wished to be His disciples. He announced in brief and unmistakable terms that unless men were willing to accept the truths which He came to preach they could not enter the Kingdom of God. So important was the dogma which He proposed that without its full and unreserved acceptance men would be damned. Nor did this mission cease when the visible presence of the Master was withdrawn. He founded a self-perpetuating body of men, whom He commissioned to go forth into the whole world teaching all men and requiring them to believe, on peril of their eternal salvation, whatsoever things He had taught them.

Today, no maxim is more widespread among those who cannot bear the yoke of the Gospel than that proposed by the New York clergy on the second Sunday of Lent. But none is more absurd in the light of psychology, none more disastrous when tested by the life of Jesus. Unless a man has a "creed" of some sort, false in itself, perhaps, but apprehended by a fallible intellect as true, he cannot act rationally, and unless he is willing to admit the teachings of Jesus Christ, invincible ignorance alone stands between him and an eternal hell.

The Professors See a Light

AFTER a protracted investigation the Committee of the American Association of University Professors has published its conclusions on "Academic Freedom in War Time." Nearly three years ago, this committee issued a report on the same subject, the general tenor of which was that, in spite of dean, president, Church and State, "academic freedom" amply justified a professor in proposing to the callow youth of his classes whatever appeared to him to be the truth. That, by the common persuasion of mankind, this alleged truth might be deemed an arrant falsehood or a palpable error did not alter the case. The matter was purely subjective: that was true and useful which to the professor seemed true and useful. Any differences of opinion were ultimately passed upon by the supreme court, the professor himself. If on investigation, sober and sincere, he felt himself impelled to teach that, since to hold property is immoral, the students should forthwith constitute themselves a committee of pickers and stealers to remove all the property of the University and give it to the Socialists, it was sheer bigotry and oppression to transfer him from his chair to a comfortable cell in the county jail.

Beyond the signers, and a few kindred spirits, no one took the 1915 declaration of independence seriously. College students are notorious jokers, but harmless, as a rule, and the general public was content to believe that the professors were simply taking a lesson from their pupils. But with the entrance of the United States into the world-war, a world of realities, the utter sham of the whole report speedily became apparent, even to the signers. The current report of the association yields to the pressure of the times, and betrays without regret the high principles so courageously announced three years

ago. The old and absurd position that anything which seemed true might and should be proclaimed, without regard for the requirements of prudence, courtesy or common sense, has been abandoned. Out of the mist of words, the professors now rise to the conclusions, cautious if not courageous, that violators of the law "may legitimately suffer deprivation of academic tenure"; and they even unbend so far as to admit that a professor who advocates resistance to the draft-law may be scholastically decapitated. No doubt the entire country, beginning with the Supreme Court of the United States, breathes more freely since the publication of the maganimous admission that an American university professor is not above the law of the land.

No less a force than a world-war was required to jolt these dwellers in academic and intellectual shadows from their Nirvana of sublimated nonsense into an attitude in which the elements of common sense are not entirely rejected. Having vindicated the majesty of the civil law, will our intellectual leaders now proceed to a higher level? "Academic freedom" no longer justifies the preaching of rebellion against the State in our universities. But what of the law of God? Perhaps the saner atmosphere which war, in spite of its horrors, always brings, may yet teach even our university professors that no rebellion against the law of God, or against that law of his nature known to man independently of revelation, can be justified on the plea of "academic freedom." But as yet that edict has not been promulgated by the American Association of University Professors.

Superstition in the War

ONE of the curious things about the war is the impetus it has given to the practice of superstition. Only the ignorant, it was to have been expected, would be so weak-minded as to have recourse to such absurdity; this however has not been the case, and a not inconsiderable literature has grown up since the outbreak of hostilities, devoted to setting forth the manifold forms in which this world-old folly has been revived. None of the nations has been exempt. Even some Catholics, who through the constant insistence of the Church on the malice of superstition certainly should have known better, have laid themselves open to the danger of contamination. Hence the Church has found it necessary to expose in unequivocal language the folly and the wickedness of this survival of paganism, and to warn its children to have no part in it.

At first sight it would appear incredible that men of the twentieth century should attribute to mere pieces of wood and metal and to set forms of words the power to insure them protection in battle and immunity from disease; but the records of history show that in times of great danger this has been a marked tendency of ill-instructed minds. Barbarous peoples have not been the only ones who have had recourse to foolish measures to ward off physical evils; those addicted to astrology

naturally did the same; and even the intelligent Greeks and the hard-headed Romans were not above such practices. That those present-day soldiers who are without a sure moral and religious anchorage should have fallen into superstition is not altogether surprising. The wonder is that any Catholics should have been tempted to be guilty of it.

Superstition, as it appears on the war-fronts, manifests itself mainly in attributing to the use of charms and to the repetition of set formulas of prayer an infallible efficacy to ward off wounds and to prevent sickness and death. The Church would be the last to discountenance the saying of prayers with the view of invoking Divine protection, provided they were said with reliance on God's providence, with abandonment to His will, and with the realization that no set form of words has an unfailing power to obtain temporal favors. God has never promised any such certain and absolute efficacy. Yet this is precisely the efficacy attributed to the formularies in use, as if compulsion were put on God by this means to grant such requests, whether He wills to do so or not. The use of such prayers in such a spirit, even when they are not in themselves heterodox, is superstitious and sinful.

True, the Church approves the wearing of images and medals, blessed for a set purpose, provided they be recognized to have in themselves no supernatural efficacy. If they be used as a mark of devotion to the Saints or Our Lady or Christ Himself, as an indication of interior love or an outward mark of loyalty, as reminders to live the life consonant with the wearing of such things, as a sort of silent invocation for the intercession of those dear to God, and as freighted with the impetratory power of the Church; their use is not blameworthy but laudable. Superstition creeps in, when to the mere wearing of a piece of metal or cloth is attributed infallible protection against physical evil. Such power does not reside in these things by their nature, it is not communicated to them by God. Strangely enough, people realize this. From whom then do they expect protection—from the devil? Perhaps. But be this as it may, the practice is entirely wrong and silly.

A Methodist Bishop in Camp

THE Methodist Bishop, Charles Bayard Mitchell, according to his own account in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, has recently spent a month in three of our camps in the Southeast, preaching in the Y. M. C. A. huts to Protestants, Catholics and Jews, and bringing Christianity for the first time to the Catholic soldier-boys. This is a delightful revelation. Some nights, he tells us, he addressed as many "Roman" Catholics as Protestants, and then adds the enlightening information:

The Catholics gather in the Young Men's Christian Association buildings, receive the khaki-bound copy of the New Testament, and rejoice for the first time in the possession of a portion of the Word of God. They are hearing for the first time, many of them, the preaching of the Gospel, and are deeply interested in the strange, new preaching which insists that there must be a

vital relation between creed and conduct. They are learning the inconsistency of coming away from Mass, where their knees knelt before the sacred symbol, and at once returning to their gambling and their profanity.

What a wonderful discovery! Catholics who have never heard the Gospel! Yet it is read and preached on every Sunday, in every Catholic church throughout the land, perhaps from six to eight times or oftener at the successive Masses. More wonderful still, it was left for the apostolic Bishop, during his campaign of proselyting in our American camps, to discover that many of the children of the Faith "for the first time" heard from his lips the "strange, new preaching" of an actual relation between creed and conduct. Catholics, it appears, are wont to rise from their superstitious worship of a "symbol" to go out straightway and indulge to their heart's delight in "gambling and profanity." Yet the most serious difficulty that many find in embracing the Catholic religion is the stern insistence of the Church upon the absolute conformity of their lives with her teaching. As for the distribution of copies of portions of the Sacred Scriptures, Bishop Mitchell has apparently never heard of the khaki-bound Catholic version of the New Testament, which the Church is doing her best to distribute among her Catholic soldiers.

The time has come when in the name of patriotism, if not in the name of truth and religion, an end should be put to such offensive and insulting language. Neither Christianity nor the war can profit from a campaign of slander, carried on in the midst of the greatest cataclysm of history. For the honor of Methodism, or denominationalism of whatever kind, such un-American and unchristian methods should be discontinued. It is ridiculous to represent the great Catholic Church, whose history dates back to the days of Christ and whose teaching is drawn exclusively from the authentic Gospels and the Apostolic traditions, as a pagan superstition, whose worshipers kneel before a symbol, whose doctrine has no relation to morality, and whose teaching abhors the Gospel as the owlet the light of day. Why will Protestant editors continue to print in their journals such offensive, absurd and insulting slanders, whether due to mere ignorance or prompted by a false and brutal bigotry?

But there is a practical lesson for Catholics. Protestant proselytism in our camps is presented as an avowed fact. It was under the auspices of the National War Council of the Young Men's Christian Association that this man was introduced to our soldiers. We are glad to recognize the many courtesies received from the Y. M. C. A., without which Catholic chaplains would often have found themselves in sore distress, but apparently there are serious dangers to be guarded against, such, for instance, as those disclosed by the ranting Bishop. Hence the great need of providing Catholic chaplains, of promoting the efforts of the Knights of Columbus, and of stationing Catholic representatives everywhere among our Catholic soldiers, that they may not be deprived of

their highest inheritance at the very time they are preparing to offer for their country the supreme sacrifices that war may demand of them.

"The Overzeal of Latin Catholics"

THE Boston *Evening Transcript's* highly vagarious "Churchman Afield" has lately been rambling even more deviously than usual, for he tells us that "Leaders in the Church of England and in the Episcopal Church in the United States are taking steps to bring about a reduction of the days, forty [of Lent] not counting Sundays, to fourteen, including Sundays." The introduction of our exceedingly inconvenient forty-day Lent was due, it seems, "to the overzeal of Latin Catholics in an attempt to make the whole year full of holy days." "When will those trouble-making Latin Catholics," we can hear the *Transcript's* wandering Churchman complain, "ever learn to practise moderation! They are incessantly carrying things too far. They pray too long, they eat too little, they believe too much. It is perfectly clear that fourteen days of Lent are quite sufficient for any one who wishes to keep his health and spirits, but those overzealous Latins perversely protract the doleful period to forty days, because they think they have a high precedent for the practice in the recorded forty-day fasts of Moses, Elias and Christ Himself."

"Those Latin Catholics are certainly an overzealous set. Without question they carry things too far. Why they actually retain in their creed such antiquated doctrines as the necessity of Baptism, the Divinity of Christ, and the eternity of hell, dogmas which we Episcopalians can reject if we please, and still be 'staunch Churchmen!' Worse yet, those overzealous Latins stubbornly refuse to allow a man to have more than one wife at a time, whereas Episcopalians, inheriting its royal founder's high scorn of Popish narrowness in this trifling matter, graciously permits the 'innocent party' in a divorce case to find another mate. But worst of all those overzealous Latins are hopelessly vulgar and ill-bred. Indeed they are quite impossible. You cannot be 'nice' and be a Romanist too. For among those overzealous Latins there are far too many poor, humble and uneducated folk to make it safe for a person of wealth, birth and breeding to join the Catholic Church. In truth, so lamentably wanting in delicacy and refinement are those overzealous Latins that they actually boast that theirs is above all others the Church of the Poor! How thankful we Episcopalians should be," perhaps the "Churchman Afield" concluded, "that we are so sane and moderate in every respect that we have the saving grace to avoid all excesses in doctrines and devotions, and we are so charmingly comprehensive that all men and women of wealth, family and position, no matter what their belief may be, naturally gravitate to our communion, and find there a chosen company of kindred spirits as unlike as possible to those vulgar, immoderate, overzealous Latins!"

Literature

THE CRITICISM OF POETRY

IMPRESSIONIST criticism, though falling into disrepute, has undoubtedly its interest and its value. If sincere and sane, it may open up new points of view, discover or emphasize disregarded attributes of a poet, and in this way may break the ground or perhaps furnish material for stable criticism. At the very least it may serve to enlighten the present and succeeding generations as to the attitude of our own critics towards poetry and the poets, and give a basis on which to estimate the literary instincts of the age.

The historical criticism of poetry has many sides and on every side merits the study lavished upon it. What, for instance, could seem more attractive to a generation like our own that has faith in its own potentialities than to trace the growth of poetry stage by stage, as it progressed towards perfection in the past? To a self-conscious generation like our own what is more fascinating than to diagnose the influence of artist upon succeeding artist—or to a practical and political generation than to connect the poet with the practical and political aspect of his times? This is the ambition of the historical critic. So also to discover the true character of the poet, often disguised rather than revealed in his verses, to unravel allusions deliberately concealed, and in general to reach beneath the actual content of the poem to a meaning and a value that are discoverable only by extrinsic research. Such historical criticism of Spenser occupies a large part of Mr. Herbert Ellsworth Cory's "Spenser, a Critical Study" (University of California Press), and we wish to make it plain that we have nothing but admiration for so scholarly a contribution to the knowledge of the great Elizabethan.

But it does seem to the writer to be important to draw a distinction between such historical criticism as this and the criticism of absolute poetry itself, which is an entirely different matter. It is one thing to study the poet and another thing to study his poetry. It is one thing to determine a poet's indebtedness to preceding and his effect upon succeeding poets, and another thing entirely to evaluate his work as a contribution to the world's literature. It is one thing, again, to bring to the surface what lay hidden in the inner consciousness of the poet when he wrote this or that satire or panegyric, and another to interpret what the poet actually expresses in his composition. Both are legitimate fields of study, but the latter alone is the proper criticism of objective poetry. Thus, it implies an insight into the mind of Robert Browning to know that he was thinking of Wordsworth when he wrote "The Lost Leader," or that he was girding at Cardinal Wiseman in "Bishop Blougram's Apology," but neither fact is inherent in the poetry itself. Such interest is quite external to the noble satire of the one and the acute analysis of the other. In the same way, to identify, with whatever circumstantial and extrinsic evidence, the characters of "The Shepherds' Calendar," or to demonstrate that Spenser, instead of being a flatterer, jeopardized his own position by running foul of Elizabeth's plans, as Mr. Cory does, is to make a contribution to the history of Spenser's character and sympathies, but cannot properly be said to increase or diminish the glory of Spenser's poetry. Any work of art depends for its value on what it expresses of itself, and not on anything gathered from without, just as it does not affect the poetic worth of Hamlet or Macbeth to prove that they were written by Bacon instead of Shakespeare. Mr. Cory himself remarks in one place that a sincere lover may write insincere love-poetry, and the reverse, though more unusual, is also possible. But in either case the strict poetical question is not whether the poet himself was sincere or insincere, but whether his poetry was one or the

other. This is the only vital question when we set out to criticize poetry as an objective art-production.

A kindred consideration is this. Spenser himself in the preface to "The Fairie Queene" expounds in outline the meaning of his allegory; and the author of the "Critical Study" adds to the exposition the further idea that in its composition Spenser was haunted by a vision of an ideal England which he hoped to bring to partial realization. Now such interpretation, we claim, depends for its validity upon one question, viz., whether the reader recognizes in the poem itself the accomplishment of these intentions of the poet. If he does not, but if he must needs constantly refer to the preface in order to remind himself that Arthur symbolizes "Magnificence" and the rest, or if even in spite of himself he is so preoccupied with the glittering pageantry that he must pause from the text and make a conscious effort to recall the interpretation thereof, then the interpretation, however authentic or however supported by data, is not a criticism of the poem, but of the poet and his aims. But these aims, not being adequately expressed, are as irrelevant to the poetry as the title affixed to a futurist painting. It is not what the poet aims at, but what he achieves that concerns the critic of poetry.

Furthermore, it is not what he says to his own contemporaries but his message to the universal heart of mankind. Many historical critics of our day insist so vehemently upon the poet being representative of his age that we are prone to assume it to be an essential ingredient of greatness. Indeed we have heard the principle asserted unblushingly. The contrary would be a truer canon. It would be safer to say that the greater the poet is, the less he represents his age. The greatness of Homer lies not in his portrayal of the customs and thoughts of Homeric civilization, but rather in the fact that, rising above the local and the temporary, he strikes chord after chord of emotion that have found an echo in the heart of every generation for three thousand years. And the interest we find in Spenser's poetry is not that he idolizes Elizabeth, nor that he fears Catholicism and abominates Puritanism, or indulges in any other fanaticism peculiar to his day. These things claim the attention of the historian. The lover of poetry sees rather that the poet expressed more sincerely or more gloriously than others have done loyalty, patriotism and whatever other ideals the whole world can sympathize with. The lover of poetry asks whether he has realized with truth and vividness the identity between Elizabeth and the Fairie Queene, and whether he has made this identity visible in his representation. These and similar considerations, and not the historical aspects of the poet, are what determine the rank of Spenser among the poets of the world.

And so it is that we do not care in the least that the poem suited the tastes of its own day, nor yet that it suits the tastes of ours. Mr. Cory pardons the incoherence of Spenser because of the immensity of his conception; Dryden might well have blamed the immensity of the conception because it marred the unity of the poem. Both blame and pardon are irrelevant until we can reach some satisfactory theory of relative values. The critical facts are that the design was broad—and the author interprets this design with skill—and, secondly, that the great design was not well grasped or executed. The business of the critic is to set a reasoned value upon these two facts if he can, or else to realize both facts vividly and in full measure, as indeed the author has done, and not to justify the defect nor to minimize the merit in the spirit of an advocate or partisan, the first of which the author has not always succeeded in escaping.

Like the most of modern critics, Mr. Cory is skeptical to the point of timidity of general canons of criticism. Yet it is only

by being cautiously bold in formulating at least tentative principles that we can make a substantial addition to the study of art. The author of this work is well equipped by the range of his information to indulge in a little such audacity. He has brought together an array of critical opinions concerning Spenser ranging from the poet's day to our own. If, instead of adding to these his own judgment, he had correlated the verdict of the centuries and had made an attempt to generalize on the rather safe principle "*Quod semper et ubique et ab omnibus*," we think that his labor would have been still better spent and his work made more valuable for all time.

From what we have said, it will be gathered, we trust, that, even as it stands the "Critical Study" of Spenser is a valuable treatise for the student of the poet. As a matter of fact, in a volume of nearly 500 pages, the author analyzes and interprets all of the poems in minute detail. In the course of this interpretation he quotes generously from a large number of modern critics, either to substantiate his own point of view or to reprobate theirs. In the very entertaining concluding chapter, which covers more than one hundred pages, he discusses all the important utterances both in prose and verse concerning his subject down to modern times; and finally, after frankly acknowledging himself to be an ardent votary of his poet even from childhood days, he summarizes conveniently his own conclusions which have been dispersed and expanded throughout the volume. This should prove the book to be desirable in any library of literary criticism.

We must add in conclusion that we regret we cannot say as much as this for Mr. Cory as a moralist. His ethical ideas are often vague to the last degree, and seem singularly fluid and fluctuating, and, when we have had the patience to extricate his meaning, they have sometimes proved simply untenable.

F. M. CONNELL, S.J.

REVIEWS

Hearts of Controversy. By ALICE MEYNELL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.75.

The six essays in this book are characterized by that rare critical discernment and high distinction of style that always mark Mrs. Meynell's prose. In the opening paper, "Some Thoughts of a Reader of Tennyson," she well says that he certainly *worked* at his verses but that "He makes somewhat too much show of the hiding of his art," and that "He has more imagination than imagery." After separating what was of passing value in Tennyson from what is permanent, Mrs. Meynell reaches the conclusion that

He is one of the few fountain-head poets of the world. . . . The lovely unbeloved is . . . the matter of his poetry and not its inspiration. . . . He is fresh with the things that others have outworn. . . . His was a new appreciation of nature. . . . He showed the perpetually transfigured landscape in transfiguring words. He is the captain of our dreams. Others have lighted a candle in England, he lit a sun.

In "Dickens as a Man of Letters," this Catholic essayist points out that that great Victorian novelist, though he imagined a larger number of evil people than did Thackeray, had a more eager faith in good ones than his renowned contemporary possessed. In answer to the familiar objection that Dickens did not know how to draw either a gentleman or a lady, Mrs. Meynell instances Cousin Feenix and Esther Summerson as proofs of the contrary, and singles out for special praise his unusual gift of always being able to tell just "what happened," and she then cites numerous apt passages from Dickens' works to show how infallibly he does it. Finally she maintains that pages penned by the author of "Nicholas Nickleby," notwith-

standing frequent assertions to the contrary, can "be parsed as strictly as any man's" and that "His grammar is not only good but strong." In her paper on "Swinburne's Lyrical Poetry" the author convicts that singer, who laid himself out "to delight and seduce," of having "a perverid fancy rather than an imagination," of being "a poet with puny passions, a poet with no more than the momentary and impulsive sincerity of an infirm soul, a poet with small intellect." The essay on "Charlotte and Emily Brontë" calls the reader's attention to those writers' remarkable genius for selecting the exact word that was required to express their thought perfectly, and to the striking vividness of the images they could call up, as when Charlotte wrote: "I looked at my love; it shivered in my heart like a suffering child in a cold cradle." The two concluding papers in the volume, "Charmian" and "The Century of Moderation," will make the admirer of Mrs. Meynell's prose regret keenly that they are so short.

W. D.

The Expansion of Europe. By RAMSAY MUIR. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$1.00.

This book is the second in a series of three, in which the author, who is Professor of Modern History in the University of Manchester, has made an interesting effort to interpret and unify the theoretical principles of political philosophy which must govern the world after the war. From a wide study of the colonization by which Western civilization has spread since 1492, he comes to the conclusion that the world has now at last really been made one by that civilization and that no theory is tenable that does not take in the whole world as one society, a striking return by induction to the position that three centuries ago Suarez enunciated a priori. ("*De Leg.*" II, ch. 19, s. 9). Thus he defines the true imperialism as one that preserves ancient civilizations intact until they have become sufficiently modified to receive self-government; that gives its subject backward peoples the reign of law; that gives its settlers of European tradition, the fullest self-government, and a complete encouragement to national unity. These principles are gained by a study of the oldest and most experienced colonizing nations, France and England, who followed them, not as a theory and an ideal, and not without failures now and again, but as a fact and a practice.

To this doctrine that the function of a ruling power is that of a trustee on behalf of its subjects and on behalf of civilization, is opposed the doctrine of power, "the doctrine that the highest duty of every State is to aim at the extension of its own power, and before this duty every other consideration must give way." This latter is illustrated by the practice of Germany in her African colonies, especially among the Hereros. Thus from what in the past has been a successful and beneficial colonial policy the author erects a political theory for the world to be governed by in the future. It is, on the whole, a valuable and acceptable one, and yet at bottom it is after all a sort of higher utilitarianism. St. Thomas long ago supplied for such a theory the only reasonable and permanent foundation, the eternal and natural law. ("*Summa*," 1 2, qq. XC-XCV).

Again the book would also gain by a wider and deeper study of Latin America, whose present state, where it is disappointing, is not due, as is here implied, to the failure of Spain and Portugal, which really held a higher form of the trustee-theory, (Francisco Vittoria, "*De Indis Prior*," Tom. I, p. 358, ed. Lyons, 1557), but to the short-sighted and selfish machinations of Freemasonry. A perusal of the actual Bull "*Inter Cetera*" will convince Mr. Muir that Alexander VI did not in the interests of Spain and Portugal close the seas against all other nations, but merely gave an arbitral decision imposing no obligation beyond those two alone. Besides it was merely a diplomatic document, with no reference to orthodoxy, as the author implies. The book has several good maps.

J. W. P.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The spring number of the *Catholic Convert* begins with a good paper by Dr. James J. Walsh on "American Physician Converts," in which he cites the case of Dr. Thomas Dwight, Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet and Dr. Horatio Storer, all leaders in their profession, to prove that stanch Catholicism and eminence in medicine and surgery are by no means incompatible. R. J. Walker, M. A., writes that the British Empire with its 13,000,000 Catholics may now claim to rank in a certain sense as a Catholic Power, for "Wherever the British flag flies, the Roman Catholic Church enjoys at least that minor degree of legal establishment which consists in complete recognition by the State, the right to hold property, the right to unhampered liberty of worship, and the right to proselytize without let or hindrance." Miss Eva Dorsey Carr continues her interesting account of the way she became a Catholic, Mr. Harry Wilson tells "The Story of Mary of the Cafeteria and How She Was Brought into the Church," and Father Scott has a convincing paper on "The Hand of God in the Church."

The March *Catholic World* offers its readers an attractive table of contents. Theodore Maynard opens the number with a paper on "The Guild Idea." George Nauman Shuster follows with an article on "The Ancient Vision and the Newer Needs," which is an examination of Emerson's philosophy, Joseph V. McKee has a strong exposition of the perils of "Woman and Child Labor Under War Conditions," calls attention to the grave mistakes in this matter the European nations now see they have made and shows that we are guilty of similar follies over here. Brother Leo writes about "Jane Austen and the Comic Spirit," Katherine Brégy about "Aspects of Recent Drama in English," paying special attention to Stephen Phillips' plays. Moorhouse I. X. Millar, S.J., has a thoughtful article on "Carlyle and the Nineteenth Century," Mary G. Segar finds "Echoes of the Canticle of Canticles in Medieval Literature," Edmund T. Shanahan, S.T.D., examines "St. Matthew and the Parousia," Charles F. Aiken, S.T.D., writes on "The Myth of Soulless Woman," Joseph Francis Wickham on "The Glory of Padua" and Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., and Caroline Giltinan each contribute a poem to the number.

"Marching on Tanga" (Dutton, \$1.50), by F. Brett Young, is an unusual war-book. First of all, the scenes it portrays are located in East Africa; and then, although a twice-torpedoed book, written by its author during his convalescence from serious wounds, it bears none of the marks of disconnectedness that characterize so many of the war-chronicles which are turned out every month, but is a well-written book. However that very fact gives the work an impression of unreality. For it is incredible that anyone, while struggling across the pest-ridden swamps, or crawling through the tangled bush, of southern Africa, could have indulged in the poetical musings which fill every page. If he had such thoughts he could not remember them so accurately after long weeks of the resulting exhaustion and fever.—"The Great Crime and Its Moral" (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 6/), by J. S. Wildmore, is a summary of the indictment against Germany and the Central Powers. It has confined in brief all the important evidence which goes to convict these nations of guilt in the inception, precipitation and brutal conduct of the war. The harrowing recital of the atrocities perpetrated by the invading armies in their occupation of Belgium, France and the East reads like a chapter from the life of Genghis Khan, and by comparison makes Attila somewhat of a philanthropist. The moral is evident.

EDUCATION

Not German, but Germanism

THE most drastic action of its kind yet taken by any American commonwealth is set forth in the sweeping resolution just made by the North Dakota State Board of Education ruling that the teaching of the German language shall be discontinued in all public schools of that State after July 1, 1918. Many city boards in other States have, as a result of the war, already given orders that the compulsory study of German be discontinued, and in some localities the teaching of that language has been informally abandoned, by choice, but this is the first instance in which a State Board actually removed German from the curriculum.

Is the action of the North Dakota Board wise and foresighted? Of the motive, there can be no question. In the final resolution the question must be granted to be local: there may be conditions in North Dakota which demand such legislation. But generally speaking, are we not in danger of going to harmful extremes in matters of this kind?

THE VALUE OF THE LANGUAGE

THE point we must keep in sight is this: that it is not German, that is, the teaching of the German language, to which we as a people object, and which we have a certain reason to fear, but the teaching of Germanism in our schools. As far as the language itself is concerned, it has and will have its intrinsic value. No matter how completely the German military power is beaten in this war, and no matter how severely it is made to suffer for its crimes, the German tongue will continue to be spoken, and will continue to be the key to one of the world's great literatures. In view of that, we will be only biting off our nose to spite our face in altogether dropping it. Of course, no one argues that German will ever become an international medium, such as French. The experiences of American travelers in Europe have demonstrated that; for we who have had our German in high school or college, and have gone abroad, have found ourselves able to use that German in Germany only. Had we been given French instead, we could not only have gone with ease through the Latin countries of the Continent, but even in Germany it would have served us almost as well as did our halting school-book command of *Deutsch*. As far as utility is concerned, it would indeed be better for us to teach French and Spanish in our schools. But this does not invalidate the literary value of German. Scholars will continue to be interested in the language, however it may fall short of other foreign tongues as an international and commercial medium of exchange.

WHY THE OUTCRY?

WHY then the outcry against the teaching of German in our schools? Is it pure jingoism? Is it a case of losing our heads? Have we permitted the passions of war to lead us to extremes that we shall yet regret?

It is not altogether jingoism, nor perfervid patriotism. There is a basis for the alarm against the teaching of German in American schools; and it is this basis that we must discover in order to discuss the question with clear heads. The true reason for the opposition against German in the schools, whether that opposition expresses itself merely in a personal dropping of the study or in such drastic action as that just taken in North Dakota, is simple. The teaching of the German language has been, and is being, utilized as a medium of propaganda by those who rank Teutonic ideals above the ideals of America. German in our schools has become too often "Germanism," the inculcating of a *kultur* alien and antagonistic to American principles. This is true of our public schools, as investigation has plainly shown.

In regard to these schools, the investigations of the Public Safety Commission of Minnesota, for an example, recently

revealed these facts: Two hundred schools in that State are at present using German, in whole or in part, as a medium of instruction. Ten thousand children in the Commonwealth of Minnesota are being brought up practically as aliens, with more familiarity with the language of Germany than the language of their own country. This does not mean that the children in these schools are merely "learning German." It means that they are being taught in German, that they are being shaped and molded into German, and not American, citizens.

DISQUIETING FACTS

THIS is the record of but one State, and a State bordering closely enough on North Dakota to throw some light, perhaps, on the action of the Board of Education of the latter place. And what of the rest of the country? A survey of the question, made recently by the Bureau of Education at Washington, and relating particularly to studies below the seventh grade, reveals the fact that in nineteen cities having a population of 25,000 or more the teaching of foreign languages prevails; and of these nineteen, twelve are wholly given over to German. In a few cities, Cincinnati among the number, German is taught in all the grades of the elementary schools, and this has been done for over forty years.

Is there anything in these figures to cause us alarm? There would not be, did all this mean merely the study of a foreign language, as an accomplishment, but the facts show that it means far more. The facts that the war has disclosed are disquieting. They are plainly these: that in communities where German is in common use, and not only taught, but utilized as the medium of instruction in all branches of study in the schools, the development of patriotic sentiment and loyal support of the American government has been retarded to a degree that can no longer be countenanced.

AN INSIDIOUS DANGER

BUT does the teaching of German necessarily, and inevitably, connote the teaching of Germanism? We need not dwell on the problem of the German press in America to answer that question, although, in passing, it is impossible for us to blink the fact that the true source of the power of that press, which has done so much already to blind and deceive our fellow-citizens of German blood, has been the so-called German-American school. A glance, rather, at some of the text-books used in those schools will better serve to clear the question. There is one book, for instance, still in use in many of our schools: *Im Vaterland*, a supplementary reader, even the cover of which carries its message to youthful minds, and the frontispiece of which is a portrait of the Kaiser. This book is a genuine implement of the propaganda of Germanism, instead of a mere innocent help in the study of the language of Germany, as it purports to be. Here are some of the doctrines—for they are nothing short of that—insidiously woven into the story it presents of a tour of the Fatherland, the burden of this story being a glorification of every Teutonic institution, custom and principle that can possibly be enumerated:

Germany must have a great army, because it is surrounded by enemies.

Germany is great because of Bismarck's formula of blood and iron.

None of Germany's children love her as much as those who have come to America.

Germans who have left the Fatherland must never forget the German tongue, but must cherish it as the dearest of all gifts; or woe betide them.

O, Germany, of all your children none love you as dearly as we Germans, far from you, across the sea!

This is the sort of thing that is being taught to American children in our schools, and this is but a sample.

OBJECTIONABLE TEXTS

ANOTHER is the well-known tale *Höher als Die Kirche*, which is German propaganda pure and simple, touching on the question of Alsace-Lorraine, altogether, of course, from the German side. Still others are Manley's *Ein Sommer in Deutschland*, Gronow's *Geschichte und Sage*, Niese's *Aus Danischer Zeit*, Werner's *Heimathlang*, and Prokosch's *Lern und Lesebuch*. These books, and many others like them, contain the propaganda of Germanism to which Americans object.

There may be no question of the loyalty of our schools. But there is a question concerning the teaching of Germanism to our children. The sooner the question is settled the better. The thing cannot be countenanced and must be done away with, however our boards of education may manage it.

CHARLES PHILLIPS.

SOCIOLOGY

The Children's Year

APRIL 6, the anniversary of the entrance of the United States into the world war, marks the beginning of the Children's Year, which is to close on April 6, 1919. During this period the lives of 100,000 of the nation's little ones are to be saved in the welfare drive now inaugurated by the Federal Children's Bureau. Each State has been assigned its definite quota of lives to be fostered in the course of the year. State councils of defense and State women's committees are called upon to assume responsibility for the State quotas which have been officially assigned. They are as follows:

	Population under five 1910 census	Quota of lives to be saved
Total	10,631,364	100,000
Maine	71,845	676
New Hampshire	39,581	372
Vermont	34,171	321
Massachusetts	328,886	3,094
Rhode Island	54,098	509
Connecticut	112,244	1,056
New York	898,927	8,455
New Jersey	266,942	2,511
Pennsylvania	884,270	8,318
Ohio	479,475	4,510
Indiana	275,524	2,592
Illinois	597,989	5,625
Michigan	298,554	2,808
Wisconsin	256,171	2,410
Minnesota	226,840	2,134
Iowa	236,063	2,220
Missouri	360,503	3,391
North Dakota	82,399	775
South Dakota	73,489	691
Nebraska	140,096	1,318
Kansas	191,519	1,802
Delaware	20,045	188
Maryland	137,714	1,295
District of Columbia	26,669	251
Virginia	268,825	2,529
West Virginia	169,118	1,591
North Carolina	332,792	3,130
South Carolina	228,459	2,149
Georgia	376,641	3,543
Florida	96,956	912
Kentucky	294,503	2,770
Tennessee	294,591	2,771
Alabama	311,716	2,932
Mississippi	259,661	2,442
Arkansas	230,701	2,170
Louisiana	224,069	2,108
Oklahoma	241,904	2,275
Texas	538,984	5,070
Montana	38,323	360
Idaho	40,444	380
Wyoming	15,331	144
Colorado	82,562	777
New Mexico	45,285	425
Arizona	24,778	233
Utah	52,698	496

Nevada	6,383	60
Washington	108,756	1,023
Oregon	60,211	566
California	193,659	1,822

The saving of these 100,000 lives is only part of the complete program which includes the welfare of the 30,000,000 children under fifteen years in the United States.

DEFECT IN THE APPORTIONMENT

The apportionment, it may be noticed, has been made on the basis of the population under five according to the 1910 census, without taking into account the varying death rates in the different States. The period under five years is regarded as particularly hazardous, and hence the efforts of the campaign are directed mainly to the salvage of children at this stage of life. Since the registration both of deaths and births of infants has been seriously deficient in a large number of the States, it follows that a high mark may be set for some States which have already a low death rate, and a very moderate mark for other sections of the country where the death rate has been excessively high. But this inequality is unavoidable. "If the registration of births and deaths were complete in all the States," says the Children's Bureau, "an apportionment of quotas of the 100,000 lives to be preserved by the various States could be made upon a different basis."

WHY 100,000?

It is the common conviction of public health authorities that one-half the deaths of infants in our country are easily preventable. At present 300,000 children under five years of age die each year. Not only could the lives of the 150,000 children thus lost during the past year have been saved, if babies were well born and well cared for, but medical authorities furthermore assure us that the death of most of the 150,000 mothers who died during the course of that same year could equally well have been prevented. It is clear, moreover, that in saving the lives of the children the mothers will likewise be better provided for and more carefully protected. In view of these figures the Children's Bureau believes that it is not asking too much in demanding the rescue of 100,000 infants during the coming year, in spite of the withdrawal of a large proportion of doctors and nurses for war service.

Not only is it the purpose of the Bureau to prevent the unnecessary deaths of so many thousands of our little ones, but it would also preserve them in better health. It is well known that the examinations of the conscripts have resulted in a considerable number of rejections because of physical defects. Many of these, the Bureau believes, could have been remedied in infancy or in early childhood, had they then been recognized.

EXAMPLE OF ENGLAND AND NEW ZEALAND

Very interesting facts in regard to possibilities of preserving child life are revealed in the report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Local Government Board for England and Wales, published in 1917. It enables us to compare the number of infants in each district who died during the years 1916 and 1917. While the general confusion of the first year of the war resulted in a large increase in infant mortality, there was an actual lowering in the death rate during the second year of the war, far below that which had obtained previous to war itself. This result was due to the financial aid granted to the various sanitary districts and to the policy of securing health visitors for every mother and baby, establishing health centers for consultation and providing hospital care for sick mothers and babies.

The strongest argument, however, is drawn from the New Zealand statistics, which show that the rate of infant mortality has steadily decreased in spite of the war and is now almost exactly half the rate for the registration area of the United States. This implies that one baby in twenty dies in New Zealand whereas one baby in ten dies in the United States.

METHODS PROPOSED

The methods by which it is proposed to save the lives of the children are thus briefly summarized by the Children's Bureau:

- (1) The registration of births so that there may be an immediate record of every child born; and nursing and medical skill may be provided wherever family income does not permit its being secured independently.
- (2) For every mother prenatal care, necessary care of doctor and public nurse at confinement, and after care.
- (3) Children's conferences where well babies can be taken periodically to be weighed and examined, and clinics where sick children may be given medical advice.
- (4) The organization of State and city divisions or bureaus of child hygiene.
- (5) The guarding of the milk supply, that every child may have his quota of clean, pure milk.
- (6) An income making possible decent living standards.

The Children's Year is to be inaugurated by a nation-wide weighing and measuring of babies and children of pre-school age, to be concluded within the first sixty days. It is maintained that weight and height constitute in general a fair standard of development. The records will all be gathered and tabulated by the Bureau.

THE MORAL ASPECT

An aspect which the Children's Bureau overlooks, and which is the most vital of all, is that which concerns the religious influences which alone can restrain the vices and self-indulgence of countless mothers. Aside from the pagan refusal on the part of many women to bear the burdens of motherhood, and the vicious doctrines of birth control, which are likely to be urged with a particular insistence during a campaign like the present, there is the further fact that the purity and religious habits of mothers constitute a physical safeguard for their children. If the child is to be truly well born it should be born of a mother in whom the observance of the law of God has created a sweet harmony between the faculties of soul and body, where sense is subject to reason, and reason bows to faith. In this and in no other way shall we secure for our children their full heritage, physically and intellectually no less than morally. Yet religion, though the most important, is evidently not the only consideration. It presumes that all purely natural precautions are likewise taken. But the perfection of physical well-being can exist only in a chaste and God-fearing generation.

OUR DUTY AS CATHOLICS

The object of the present article is merely to offer a general statement of the facts connected with the present campaign, its purpose, reason and methods, without attempting any discussion. Whatever the results may be, it is well for Catholics to learn the lesson of the needless loss of so many lives of both mothers and children. Every effort should be made within each parish to prevent this wastage and detriment to Church and nation. As Catholics we shall need in the future all the strength of our young manhood and womanhood for the promotion of the great interests of God. It is no slight contribution to the Catholic apostolate to aid in multiplying the possible workers in the vineyard of the Lord, and it is high time that we assume a far more serious attitude towards our apostolic mission in the world. As citizens and patriots we know that we can render no better service to the land of our birth or adoption than to give to it the greatest number possible of true Catholic citizens. Their loyalty to God will be the surest pledge of their intense loyalty to the Stars and the Stripes, wherever they may wave.

J. H.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Navy and Militia Chaplains

A COMPLETE list of chaplains in the navy, showing their rank, denomination and present duty, including the acting chaplains and those in the naval militia and the naval reserve,

is printed in a recent number of the *Official Bulletin* issued weekly by the Committee on Public Information. There are twenty-two navy chaplains, the majority of them ranking as captains. Four are Catholics, of whom two rank as captains and two as lieutenants, junior grade. The acting chaplains of the navy number seventy-nine, the rank in every instance being that of lieutenant, junior grade. Twenty of these are Catholics. The naval militia chaplains are ten in all, eight of them belonging to the Protestant Episcopal Church. There is no Catholic priest on this list. Of the eleven naval reserve chaplains one is a Catholic priest with the rank of lieutenant, junior grade. The grand total in all branches is 122, including twenty-five Catholics.

New York Catholic War Fund

THE Knights of Columbus drive in the archdiocese of New York aims at collecting between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 during the week beginning March 17. Outlining the purpose of the fund Cardinal Farley says:

We are asking the people of the Archdiocese of New York, Protestant, Jew and Catholic, for this money. We are asking it to finance extensive religious and social work in our army and navy stations. We shall not for one moment conceal the fact that we seek this money as Catholics, and that our first aim is to protect the faith and morals of our Catholic soldiers and sailors. The material comforts, the social and recreational facilities which we supply will be at the service of every man in the army and navy, but our chief concern in undertaking this work is the spiritual welfare of the sons of Holy Church.

Gentlemen, we have a right and a just claim to public support in this movement. Our right and our claim are based upon the fact that the great Church which we represent is the strongest and most enduring defender of this Government. We represent one-third of the population of this great city, and we confidently assert that in every contribution of service to the nation from New York, one-third at least has been Catholic.

To assure to the Knights of Columbus the entire sum desired from the archdiocese for their magnificent work each parish is asked to collect a stipulated amount. The Knights of Columbus war budget up to December 1 of the present year calls for an expenditure of \$7,500,000. Of this sum approximately \$4,500,000 is to be provided for overseas activities, \$1,000,000 for construction, equipment and maintenance of buildings in camps, and \$1,000,000 for the support of chaplains and for stationery and incidentals. More than eighty buildings have already been constructed in camps and cantonments in this country.

Righteous Patriotism

FOR some time past the editor of a frowsy Methodist journal, the *Christian Advocate*, a paper that has more respect for turgid rhetoric than historical truth, has been yapping vociferously at the Pope because forsooth His Holiness is pro German. And the humor of it is that the *Advocate's* last yelp had scarcely died away when, according to the *New York Times*, under date of March 8, "the leaders of the New Jersey Methodist Conference" declared "that the courses of study laid down by the commission which maps out the teachings for new ministers of the faith are 'nothing more than another form of German propaganda teachings that have their organization in Germany.'" If Methodists are to be believed the *Advocate* should sell its bark and buy a shovel for the stable at home. This advice becomes all the more necessary in view of these words, spoken recently in the Senate by Senator Gallinger of New Hampshire.

If there was any soldier on the Union side during the Civil War who was not a good soldier, who has not received a pension, I do not know who he is. He can always find men of his own type, equally poor soldiers, who would swear that they knew that he had been in the hospital at a certain

time, whether he was or not—the records did not show it, but they knew it was so—and who would also swear that they knew he had received a shock which affected his hearing during a certain battle, or that something else happened to him; and so all those pension claims, many of which are utterly worthless, have been allowed by the Government, because they were "proved." . . . Why, look at the so-called Methodist Book Concern claim! Just give a moment's thought to that, Senators who were here when that bill was passed. The Methodist Book Concern—I think of Nashville, Tenn.—came in here with a claim of seventy-odd thousand dollars, as I remember, for the occupation of the building that they employed as a publishing house; and it was sworn before the Court of Claims that they were loyal men, every one of them devoted to the Union cause, that there was not a Confederate among them. It was further testified upon the authority of a very distinguished man that that claim was so honest that they had not employed any attorney to prosecute it; and upon those representations the claim was passed. But it developed shortly afterwards that in that concern they were printing Hardie's "Military Tactics" for the Confederate Army, and that they were actually making munitions of war also for the Confederate cause; and it further developed that, in place of there being no attorney employed, almost one-half of the amount of that claim went to an attorney, the matter becoming so notorious that the Methodist Church demanded that that money should be returned to the United States, but it was not returned.

In case the *Advocate* cannot find a shovel sufficiently large and durable for this midden heap, it might be persuaded to continue to yap, but not at the Pope.

"Great Secret Order" Opens Attack

AN open manifestation of anti-Catholic propaganda recently occurred before the Maryland Legislature during the House Committee's hearing of two bills aimed at the destruction of Catholic institutions. They had been introduced by Delegate Benjamin Haughey, of Baltimore, at the instance of George Waldron, editor of an anti-Catholic paper and national organizer of the "Great Secret Order of America." Waldron himself spoke before a gallery packed with his followers who vociferously applauded at the signal or desire of their leader. The following is in part a description of his address as reported in the *Baltimore Sun*:

Waldron began his address with the statement that he intended to make no attack on any religion. Yet, although he spoke nearly an hour the two bills which he was supposed to speak for were scarcely mentioned, except during the last 10 minutes. The rest of the speech was devoted entirely to Catholics at the head of Government bureaus and in other Government positions; Catholics as soldiers in the United States army, fighting abroad or preparing to fight; a Catholic priest at the head of the American Red Cross in Italy, so highly praised by the Italian Government; Catholics on the draft boards throughout the country who, Waldron said, "were reaching in and grabbing out of the minority such a large number of Catholic soldiers." He was referring to the fact that, while the Catholics comprise only about 15 per cent of the entire population of the country, records show they have at least 35 per cent and probably a greater percentage of the membership of the United States army. This fact seemed to gall Waldron more than anything else, and he drew sinister inferences from it. Although he used it then as a basis for his argument, later in his speech he referred to it as not true.

It is interesting to notice how the very patriotism of Catholics is already being used against us as a weapon for our undoing. Direct attacks were made upon Cardinal Gibbons, the Vincent de Paul Society and St. Mary's Industrial School. The purpose of the lobbyists was to withdraw all State aid from Catholic institutions. "The Roman Catholic government," was the insane charge of the anti-Catholic clique, "is the greatest graft in the State of Maryland." On the previous day another bill had been hotly debated which was described even by an indignant Masonic Delegate as "Only one of a series of bills which have been introduced here aiming blows at the Catholics."